

, 1924

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XXXI, No. 11
WHOLE NO. 770

June 28, 1924

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	245-248
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
The Movie Mind—The Heresy of Bishop Brown—International Aspects of Alcohol—After the Crusade, What?—Four British Law Lords and Three Little Irish Girls.....	249-256
COMMUNICATIONS	256-257
EDITORIALS	
Vacation Duties—The Ruler of Our Souls—The Physician and the Bottle—The Unbalanced School—The Bomb Thrower.....	258-260
LITERATURE	
A Catholic Note on Poe's "Raven"—To the Paleontologists—Reviews—Books and Authors.	260-264
EDUCATION	
Wanted: A Dictator	265-266
SOCIOLOGY	
The Right to Strike.....	266-267
NOTE AND COMMENT	267-268

Chronicle

Home News.—Secretary Hughes' reply to the Japanese note of May 31 protesting against certain provisions of the Immigration Bill passed by Congress and signed by

*Reply
to
Japan*

President Coolidge, is regarded as conciliatory in tone but firm in upholding the prerogatives of Congress to regulate immigration. The reply was made public simultaneously in Japan and the United States on June 19. It discusses the legal aspects of the question rather than the Japanese contention that the new law was in "disregard to the spirit" of the treaty existing between the two nations. Secretary Hughes begins by explaining the provisions of the new law as they apply to Japan. He enumerates the classes who are not excluded: those who are not considered immigrants, such as government officials, tourists, transients, and seamen; those who are admissible as non-quota immigrants, including former residents, lawfully admitted previously, clergymen, professors, students and business men. The document then points out that in the enactments of the present law there is no great difference from the understanding embodied in the "Gentlemen's Agreement," by which Japan voluntarily has been regulating the immigration of Japanese laborers into the United States. The substantial difference arises

only from the action of Congress to "exercise its prerogative in defining by legislation the control of immigration instead of leaving it to international arrangement." This prerogative, it is stated, has been expressly recognized by the Japanese Government. The United States Government likewise, during the past negotiations and in former agreements, has in no sense surrendered or impaired the full liberty of action in this matter; on the contrary it has always fully reserved that freedom with respect to the control of immigration. The reply of Secretary Hughes illustrates this contention by citing the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation concluded with Japan in 1894, the "Gentlemen's Agreement" of 1907-8, and the negotiations carried on prior to the treaty of 1911. While no statutory enactments concerning Japanese immigration were then thought necessary, the full power of such was reserved by this Government. Since such enactments are contained in the present law, the legislative section becomes mandatory on the executive department. The reply concludes by stating that, since the law takes effect on July 1, 1924, Japan is released after that date from further obligations in regard to the "Gentlemen's Agreement."

During the lull between the Republican and the Democratic Conventions, the Farmer-Labor Progressive party held its meetings at St. Paul. The leadership of the con-

Party Activities
vention was usurped from its organizers by William Z. Foster, head of the Workers' Party, the American Communist organization. Hence the Communist sentiment was in the ascendancy in the convention. Despite the denunciations of him by the Communist element, offers of support by the Farmer-Labor party were made to Senator La Follette. But he steadfastly repudiated them. Dependant on his future action, Duncan MacDonald and William Bouck were nominated by the convention for the offices of President and Vice-President, respectively.

Despite the outward unanimity displayed at the Cleveland Convention, the harmony in the Republican ranks is not sufficient to please the party leaders. As noted in our issue of last week, complaint was made of the attempted domination of the Convention by William M. Butler, political manager for President Coolidge. Antagonism was openly apparent between Mr. Butler and C. Bascom Slemp, secretary to the President, together with others of the older Republican groups. To bring together the discordant elements in anticipation of the national campaign,

June 28, 1924

President Coolidge has given his consent to the appointment of an Advisory Committee, of which Mr. Slemp is to be an active member. This committee is not intended to displace Mr. Butler in his management of the campaign nor is it understood to express the dissatisfaction of the President with the conduct of the Cleveland Convention by Mr. Butler.

The Democratic National Convention opened in New York on June 24 with an invocation by Cardinal Hayes. On the eve of the convention great diversity of opinion was rampant among the delegates; vigorous discussion was carried on concerning the rules of procedure and the advisability of changing the two-thirds rule for nomination, as well as in regard to the character of the platform and the choice of nominees. Of these Governor Smith and William G. McAdoo are the foremost contenders. According to the opinions of the party leaders current at this writing, the Convention will be one of the most bitterly-contested and longest in the history of the Democratic party.

Canada.—All efforts to arrive at a satisfactory adjustment of their differences with the Government having failed, the Canadian Federation of Postal Employes on

Postal Employees Strike June 18 ordered the long threatened strike of all the Dominion postal workers.

There was some confusion as to the exact time at which the strike order was to become effective, due to last minute negotiations with the Government and a telegram, later branded as false, postponing the strike for twenty-four hours. In Quebec and Ontario the postal service was badly disorganized from the beginning; by June 20 the strike had spread even through the Western provinces, and, according to Federation officials, would eventually paralyze the service throughout the entire Dominion. While admitting the seriousness of the situation, the higher postal officials declared that within a short time they would be able to carry on the service, and they immediately began to fill the positions vacated by the strikers with the large number of reserve applicants on the civil service lists. The grievances of the postal employes are of long standing, their claim being that they have not been given an adequate advance in wages to keep pace with the cost of living. They had presented their claims to the Government, which replied that it was unable to satisfy them because of the supremacy of the Civil Service Commission over this branch of the federal service. In the long negotiations that followed it was well known that the Post Office Department officials were favorable to a schedule of salaries somewhat higher than that proposed by the Civil Service Commission. But under the Act of 1919 the commission is the paramount authority not only in all appointments to the civil service but also in defining the salaries which attach to them. Its authority can be challenged only by an amending Act of Parliament.

The Government accepted for consultation, therefore, the ultimatum delivered by the executive of the Postal Federation for amendments to the Civil Service Act giving the Government power to fix the salaries of postal workers instead of that authority being exercised by the Civil Service Commission. While the demands of the strikers for an increase in wages is generally conceded to be reasonable, many of the newspapers are deplored the fact that it is permitted the employees of a great public utility to go on strike. Stern measures against the strikers are forecasted by some Government officials and it is stated that the men would not be reinstated in their positions.

France.—Accepting the invitation of M. Doumergue, the newly elected President, to form the Cabinet, M. Edouard Herriot, the former Mayor of Lyons, has announced its make-up: Premier and

New Cabinet Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Edouard Herriot; Minister of Justice,

M. Rene Renault; Minister of Finance; M. Etienne Clemental; Minister of War, General Maurice Nollet; Minister of the Interior, M. Chautemps; Minister of the Navy, M. Jacques Dumesnil; Minister of Commerce, M. Raynaldy; Minister of Public Instruction, M. Francois Albert; Minister of Public Works, M. Victor Peytral; Minister of Labor and Health, M. Justin Godart; Minister of Pensions, M. Edouard Bovier-Lapierre; Minister of Agriculture, M. Quenilla; Minister of Colonies, M. Edouard Daladier; Minister of Liberated Regions, M. Victor Dalbiez. Most of these men are without previous experience in government. The Cabinet members were presented to President Doumergue by the Premier. M. Herriot has announced that his policy with regard to the Ruhr will be continued occupation until Germany gives absolute assurance of its intention to put into effect the experts' system on reparations. The choice of General Maurice Nollet as Minister of War is taken as an indication that the new Government intends to maintain the former Cabinet's military attitude toward Germany. Much discussion has been stirred up by a proposal to reduce the army by cutting the period of military service, and the supporters of M. Poincaré, especially M. Maginot, the former Minister of War, will be determined in their opposition to any reduction, since their policy has been that under present conditions France cannot afford to weaken her military defense. Early in the week it was announced that 7,000 Germans who had been expelled from the Ruhr during the previous French régime has been allowed to return.

President Doumergue's message was read in the Chamber by the new Premier, in which he outlined the policy of the new Government, concluding with the following:

Policy Outlined My most earnest desire is with the aid of Parliament and the country to realize that peace founded on justice which both so much

desire, and to that end, within the measure of the Constitution, I shall be at the service of France, republic and democracy, which

I have served for thirty years without weakening, the experience I have gained and my absolute devotion.

The message was well received and will have the effect of allaying to some extent the strong factional spirit so bitterly manifested during the past few weeks. By a vote of 313 to 234 the Chamber of Deputies approved Premier Herriot's program of home and foreign policy. The session was stormy and M. Herriot was frequently interrupted during his speech. Touching on the delicate topic of diplomatic relations with the Vatican, the Premier stated that France was in no way hostile to Catholicism, but that there was no reason why France should consider the Pope a sovereign and maintain diplomatic relations with the Vatican. This question is certain to arouse bitter debates. The vote of confidence given to the new Government by the Chamber was somewhat tempered by the action of the Senate in refusing to elect as its President Premier Herriot's candidate, M. Bienvenu-Martin. By a vote of 151 to 134 the Senate elected M. de Selves of the Right as its President. M. de Selves was Minister of the Interior in the Cabinet of M. François-Marsal. As the Left bloc maintains a majority in the Senate the election of the Right candidate is taken as an indication that the attitude of the Left in the Senate will not be influenced by the Left majority in the Chamber.

Belgium's Foreign Minister, M. Hymans, spent some time in Paris conferring with the French Premier, and after the conference M. Hymans announced that while no

Premiers Confer specific details regarding their joint policy had been discussed, yet he felt certain that Belgium and the new Government in France would work together in harmony. Especially pleasing to many of the Belgians is M. Herriot's attitude regarding the Ruhr since M. Poincaré's policy has been considered by them an obstacle to a permanent settlement of the reparations problem. Premiers Herriot and MacDonald spent the week-end together at the British Prime Minister's house at Chequers discussing the various questions affecting the Allies. M. Herriot promised to call on M. Theunis, the Belgian Premier, at Brussels on his return from England. At this conference it is proposed to take up in detail each of the questions affecting France and Belgium, and particularly the reparations problem.

Great Britain.—Following a debate of some days on the question of adopting the preference resolutions endorsed by the Empire Economic Conference last October,

Preference Resolutions Defeated the House of Commons, by a narrow majority, rejected the first four resolutions. Mr. Stanley Baldwin, the Conservative leader, who had championed the cause of the resolutions, agreed that after the defeat of these resolutions no good purpose could be served by voting on the remainder of the conference program. In a lengthy speech, Mr. Baldwin argued that the present state of Europe rendered it imperative for Great Britain to seek

extended trade with the Dominions and that this could only be accomplished by an agreement on some kind of preferences. He stressed the effect that an adverse vote on these proposals would have upon the Dominions and declared that "if these resolutions are vetoed you will gravely imperil the future of the whole Empire. The Dominions will believe that this House has deliberately come to the conclusion that this country will have nothing more to do with preferences. They will reluctantly seek trade connections elsewhere." In submitting the preference resolutions, the Premier announced that the Government accepted no responsibility for them but merely presented them to the free vote of the House. Some anxiety, however, in regard to the effect of the vote on the Dominions was felt by leaders of both the Liberal and Labor parties who have been opposed to the preferences. Accordingly, they hastened to state that their rejection of the resolutions should not be interpreted as a desire to weaken the bonds of the Empire, and that it did not show an unfriendly spirit towards the Dominions. In particular, Mr. MacDonald declared that he was aware that he must be misrepresented in the Dominions as sacrificing their interests to his desire for trade with foreign countries. He countered the accusations by reviewing the Imperial measures of the Government, such as the efforts for Empire settlement, financial aid to industries and constitutional developments.

Italy.—Serious complications have arisen out of the kidnapping and murder of Signor Matteotti, the Socialist Deputy. Several prominent Facists, said to be participants in the crime, have already tried

Matteotti Incident to flee the country, but Premier Mussolini insists that all implicated in the murder are in custody. The Premier realizes the gravity of the situation and is quoted as saying that all concerned in the outrage will be brought to speedy justice, no matter what their position. The press and the people are demanding a full investigation and that the truth be made public. As a result of the public outcry, two officials connected with the Cabinet have resigned, Signor Finzi, Under Secretary of State for Internal Affairs, and Signor Rossi, connected with the same Department. Opposition newspapers claim that Signor Matteotti had authoritative information regarding the alleged graft of certain members of the Cabinet whose activities were being investigated, and that fear of these exposures led to his murder by political enemies. These newspapers even claim that at the time of his disappearance he had in his possession certain documents relating to these graft practices, which he intended to use in his proposed speech in the Chamber. Impressed by the activity of the officials in investigating Signor Matteotti's disappearance, the popular feeling is gradually becoming more normal, specially as many of the startling accusations made against public officials during the initial excitement have been narrowed down

to general statements of graft and malpractice, yet all are agreed that the Fascist party is in a rather delicate position because of the activities of some of its members.

Mexico.—International relations between Great Britain and Mexico are in a rather strained condition as a result of the Cummins incident. This delicate situation has cen-

British Agent Recalled tered around Herbert C. Cummins, the agent of the British Government in Mexico City, who for several days, it was reported, was besieged in the British Legation, the Mexican guards not even allowing food to be sent in. The British Premier speaking in the House of Commons said that friction between the Mexican Government and Mr. Cummins had existed for some time because of alleged courtesy of Mr. Cummins in his communications to the Mexican Government. The Mexican Government was very insistent that the British agent leave the country, and unless he was recalled by his own Government, threatened to expel him. The real cause of the difficulty was, as Mr. MacDonald explained to the Commons, that friction arose "owing to Mr. Cummins' representations on behalf of the rights of British subjects on instructions from the British Government." Premier MacDonald has made it plain that the British Government considers the action of Mexico a breach of international courtesy. The New York *Times* carried the following announcement of the Mexican Government:

The Hon. Ramsay MacDonald, British Prime Minister, held last Monday, June 16, an interview with the Mexican Consul at London, in the course of which Mr. MacDonald stated that he regarded the attitude of the Mexican Government towards Mr. Cummins as a courtesy incompatible with friendly relations, and that Mr. Cummins in defending the interests of British subjects in Mexico, was only complying with his instructions.

The announcement reviews the entire situation and concludes with the assertion that Mexico is but defending "the dignity due her as a sovereign nation." After negotiations had failed to effect a satisfactory settlement between these two countries, the British Government recalled its agent in Mexico City, and requested the United States and Chile to take care of its interests in Mexico. In addition the proposed mission of Sir J. B. Hohler to Mexico with a view to the British recognition of the Obregon Government has been canceled.

Norway.—The old prohibitions against religious Orders are gradually breaking down and the members of various Orders and Congregations are slowly establishing them-

Anti-Jesuit Legislation to Be Abolished selves again in Norway. Among the latest to enter the country were the Dominican friars. The main question under discussion now is abolition of the proscription still in force against the Jesuits. It is founded on paragraph II of the Ecclesiastical Constitution of 1624. A bill making possible the return of the Jesuits will probably be submitted to Parliament in the near future. Special legis-

lative action is required in this matter in as far as the Jesuits are specifically mentioned as excluded from Norway. Recounting the progress of recent events the English Catholic News Service writes:

As far back as 1921 the Department for Ecclesiastical Affairs sounded out the heads of the State Church. A questionnaire was sent to the Lutheran Bishops and to the professorial corps of the primary and secondary faculties of theology, as to the opportunity of doing away with this proscription of the Jesuits. Of the six Bishops, four replied in favor of abolition. There was one objection from the highest faculties, and one dissident among the professors of the secondary faculties. From these quarters, then, the objection to the return of the Jesuits is not formidable.

The usual tactics of bigotry have in the meantime been tried out in Norway, and the bogus "Jesuit oath" has been made to do service, here as elsewhere, in the campaign of defamation against the Society of Jesus.

Russia.—The fifth Congress of the Communist International opened its sessions, June 17, at the Grand Opera House in Moscow. Sixty countries, including the United States, Mexico, Canada and South America, were represented. The American delegation comprises ten youthful communists, Germany has forty delegates, France twenty, Italy twenty, England ten, and Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Argentine, Uruguay and Paraguay two each. A preponderance of representation is secured for Russia through its 136 delegates, including the most prominent members of the Communist party. Some difficulty was experienced by the foreign "bourgeois" press in obtaining entrance to the first session of the Congress, which rather indicated poor management of the committee in charge than any desire to maintain secrecy of proceedings. It is conceded that such measures as require secrecy will find adequate protection behind committee doors. The opening of the Congress excited less enthusiasm than usual, though a deeply significant feature of the celebration was the parade of the Boy Scouts, through the streets of Moscow, behind banners declaring their allegiance to communist principles. The girls marched with and even led some of the boy regiments. An American correspondent recalled Lenin's pregnant phrase, "let me teach the children for three years and I don't care what happens afterwards." A subject which will receive important consideration at the Congress, is the position of the Communist party in the United States, Canada and South America, and it is likely effective steps will be taken to extend the Communist membership in these countries.

Coincident with the opening of the Congress, the Tokio Foreign Office reports very satisfactory progress in its negotiations with the Soviet. Viscount Kato, the new Japanese Prime Minister, has directed the resumption of the Soviet-Japanese conversations in Peking and his representative is returning thence with the terms of a new agreement. The withdrawal of the Japanese troops from Northern Saghalien is shortly expected. Meantime persecution of men and women for religious reasons continues.

the
Nor-
ish

fairs
was
the
une-
the
one
the
hen,seen
been
n ofter-
pera-
ited
outh
meri-
hful
nty,
ile,
on-
ough
pers
ced
nce
nted
any
con-
find
en-
ual,
was
of
to
ven
ent
hil-
ter-
era-
nist
ica,
theokio
its
new
of
rep-
new
rom
urse-
ues.

The Movie Mind

JOHN F. FOGARTY

THE moving-picture enterprise has grown from crude beginnings into one of the huge industrial undertakings of America, and is well on the way to top place. It is bidding fair to become what the saloon was, in the not far distant past—an every block occurrence. The liquor traffic has been universally scored for paralyzing the brains of the older generation: but cannot the screen bring disease to the mental processes of our children in a more insidious, if less brutal manner? As a matter of fact, many of our level-headed educators are already deciding that a great deal of the difficulties of the classroom are directly traceable to the malign influences of sensational motion-pictures.

Surely it does not require any deep, penetrating thought to form an estimate of the harm that is being done to our children in this respect. Tarry for a moment outside any of the numberless cheap "picture palaces," and observe the antics of the little folk while they examine the lurid advertisements which announce the day's screen wares. They stand, now with bated breath and eyes wide open, now giving vent to a spontaneous outburst of enthusiasm as one, more observant than the rest, calls the common attention to the villain who is being hurled over a steep precipice into a yawning chasm beneath. The daily meal for the child's insatiable mind is made up of shootings, stabbings, infernal contrivances for human torturing which never existed, beings half-man and half-beast, plotting, scheming, intrigue, inanities, sensationalism, vulgarity. The cheaper the ticket of admittance, the more generous the output of realistic nonsense; and these places are being almost exclusively patronized by the little folk for the simple reason that they are cheap.

Of course, a parent is directly at fault for indulging the child's taste for the extravagant. Too much of even less exhilarating diversion would be bad. But mother thinks that the "kiddies" are out of harm's way in the theater: they are at least out of her way. And think of her sympathetic joy at the children's joy. When Johnny issues from the screen world, he is a new "man," drunk with the heroic. With a toy pistol in the one hand and a wooden sword in the other, he plunges wildly through the streets—they are woods, for the nonce—shoots an imaginary lion here, and fells a threatening Indian there, dodges automobiles—wolves—takes a brave leap on to a doorstep—a high peak—spies an oncoming highwayman, takes careless aim, fires—without missing, of course—leaps again to the

plains in the only way possible for the preservation of life and limb—movie heroes never die—and reaches home unscathed and out of breath. Mother listens, laughs and tells the dear child that if he will be a good boy and study his home lessons she is going to give him another dime on the morrow to see "The Teeth of the Tiger." "Sure," he'll be a good boy: but as for study—well, there he sits with his head between his hands and his eyes riveted on a book. Circumstantial evidence does undoubtedly vindicate him.

Time: a few days later. Sequel: an indignant mother hastens to Johnny's school and warmly resents the imputation of that hopeful's teacher that "he never looks at a book." Did not she, herself, see him studying, "with her own eyes"? Pity the teacher: for just now we are studying the problem from the teacher's point of view. The viewpoint is briefly this: When the mind is in the formative state, a substantial contribution to its development is derived from self-effort. So the home-work, or what is assigned to a child for study out of school, is a very vital part of his schooling. Very many parents fail or are slow to grasp this important fact, and, of course, the average boy does not see the logic of it at all. Besides, the popularity of the motion-picture has very much aggravated the difficulty. "At the movies," as an excuse for the "*tabula rasa*" condition of youthful brains, is already running a good second for the honors of plausibility with "helping mother." In truth, it conveys more meaning than is ordinarily intended; for the hours saved from the many passed in the picture palace find tiny brains in too much of a dizzy whirl to accomplish any kind of mental concentration. Under the most favorable circumstances, the plain, one hundred per cent lad does not take instinctively to any studious effort, and when Indians, gunmen, cavemen, rogues and knaves are striving for the upper hand over prosaic ponderings about arithmetic, geography and history, the series is invariably the "surer bet."

Now the remedy cannot lie in a general proscription of the moving-picture. This is not practical, nor is it fair to the boy particularly, nor is it sensible. The futility of curing by the process of killing is too well manifested in the case of the other commodity which men put into their mouths "to steal away their brains." No: it would be a cruel sentence, indeed, which decrees that the movie and the boy have nothing in common; for they have much in common. With all due respect for the claims of modern

psychologists, they are yet thousands of miles away from discovering most of the mysterious intricacies of any youthful intellect. Who of them can analyze, for instance, the need a boy has for scrupulously trailing the straight line made by the carefully set concrete blocks of a sidewalk, or will explain why a lad should seriously undertake to "boot" a tin can six or more city squares, entirely oblivious of the high cost of leather, or how he feels himself impelled to punish with a stick each rail of a long iron fence? To those of us whose lives have not become embittered by chronic boredom such boyish exuberance is ever the occasion of tearful reminiscence and of smiling recognition of ourselves as we once were, and as we hope to continue in spirit; it is all of what we mean by saying that "boys will be boys." The author of the saying, "the Boy is Father of the Man," certainly must have meant the boy who is a boy, not a male "edition" of the other sex. Strange how people learn to grow reconciled to that type of girlish frolicsomeness known as "tomboy," nay even love it, when they will not tolerate the sissy, no matter how tractable he may be; while, at the same time, they are not consistent enough to realize that a "boy-boy" has no other alternative but to be himself or his female counterpart.

And this boyish faculty for stirring up what a policeman was once heard to describe rather graphically as "particular hell" is closely allied to the movie-mania. Both are at any rate an evidence of the need the average lad feels for letting off steam. Just as modern engineering has discovered ways of utilizing, for purposes of heating, the escaping steam of a locomotive, so a well known organization has for years past been devoting itself to the laudible end of providing for what may be called the superfluous energy of the boy. Some have objected to the activities of the Boy Scouts that they tend to inveigle a boy away from his school work; but if it is a normal condition for a youth to be away, absent, at least, in the sense of Booth Tarkington's famous scholars, viz., "wool-gathering," he is far more liable to return by way of the interesting scout

program than through the smoky and noisy atmosphere of the screen world. Whatever is recreational is not essentially play: still, if the recreation afforded by the scout movement can be correctly said to make Jack a dull boy, that dulness is at least workable. Whereas, any teacher of any experience can readily testify that a mind constantly filled with claptrap and sensationalism makes barren and unprofitable soil.

The reason is obvious. The mind, like the body, requires nutriment, particularly during the formative period. Now just as a habit of inebriety tends to destroy the relish for life-sustaining food, so movie-intoxication is bound to impair all appetite for that on which the mind feeds and grows upon. It is easier to gage how much evil an excessive dose of exhilaration is liable to effect than how much good its moderate use may accomplish. This much is certain, however, that a child who is imbibing for hours and hours each week the "extravagances" ordinarily doled out by the cheaper class of cinema houses, is going to develop vagarish mental qualities very little conducive to intellectual effort.

The cure of the evil rests in the home and not in the school. Parents too often indulge their children, pamper them, and thus burdening them with these handicaps, expect teacher to perform a miracle forthwith. After a League of Nations, or a World Court, or some such institution has been established among the peoples of the earth, there are no two classes of belligerents who require some kind of a league of mutual understanding more urgently than parents on the one hand, and educators on the other. The effective way to meet a difficulty is to forestall it. Through this domestic Hague Tribunal, mother could be induced to curtail our friend Johnny's visits to the theater—at least during school term; if she could be prevailed upon to accompany him to sane productions, on Saturdays preferably, and as a reward for a favorable weekly report, teacher would, no doubt, deem it time to congratulate herself on the advent of a pedagogical millennium.

The Heresy of Bishop Brown

FLOYD KEELER

WHEN the ecclesiastical court convened in Cleveland to try the charges of heresy brought against Dr. William Montgomery Brown, retired Episcopal Bishop of Arkansas, it was practically a foregone conclusion that he would be found guilty of holding and teaching "doctrine contrary to that held by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America." The evidence consisted of excerpts from a book of which he admitted the authorship, and of belief in whose statements he made affirmation. According to report, these excerpts contain denials

not only of the truth of the articles of the Apostles' Creed, which the Modernists of today are controverting and trying to explain away, but also of the whole structure of the Creed and of the Christian Faith in general. He is alleged to have said of Jesus Christ, "I doubt if He ever lived"; to have written that "all the Gods in the skies, Jehovah, Allah, etc., are mere figments of the imagination, and human inventions, bogeys used, as it were, by the few to terrorize the many, and to have denied the objective existence of any God whatsoever; to have declared of his

June 28, 1924

A M E R I C A

251

belief in the Trinity that he accepted a trinity of "matter—force—motion" but no more. Yet Bishop Brown insists that he believes the whole Book of Common Prayer, and in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Obviously there is a difficulty in reconciling his statements, a difficulty felt by the "Church Advocate" or prosecuting attorney in the case, when he said he seemed to be in a region like that described in "Alice in Wonderland." A man who says "I believe in . . . Jesus Christ. . . born of the Virgin Mary" in his service and then in his pulpit denies that our Lord was "born of a pure Virgin" is hard enough to understand, but when one insists that he believes every statement of his Church, yet denies each one categorically it is difficult to know what to say. One's first impulse is to say that such a one is insane, and that is just what was said some years ago about Bishop Brown, but the explanation somehow did not explain. Persons who have visited him report him an apparently normal and kindly old gentleman, in full possession of all his faculties, and though sixty-nine years of age, in no wise feeble in body or intellect, and if the truth be told, rather well pleased, apparently, with the discomfiture he has been causing some of his brethren, since he is convinced that his is "the last heresy trial" and that its outcome will "make the public see the real issues involved in all heresy."

Bishop Brown's whole career, since his elevation to the episcopate at least, has been unusual to say the least of it. When he was in Arkansas where his Church profited materially by his wealth, he was continually upsetting Episcopal tradition in one way or another. First it would be an ordination in the evening, next it would be the advocacy of giving the Negro churchmen three bishops of their own and setting up an autonomous church for them, leaving them to work out their own destiny; then it would be a book advocating what he called "The Level Plan of Church Union," his thesis being to confer upon Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, etc., bishops of an Anglican order, and thus form one large "Union Church" of all Protestantism. That this plan was no more acceptable to the good people to whom this favor was to be extended than it was to his own denomination never seems to have occurred to him. And since his retirement his schemes have grown more and more unusual until four years ago his "Communism and Christianity," the latter a word of his own coining, appeared. It is this book, which seems to deny every tenet not only of Christianity but of theism, which has brought him to trial and conviction on the charge of heresy.

There is no doubt that upon any ordinary use of the term Bishop Brown's doctrine is heretical, but that is not the point. He challenges the court which convicted him to show him their standard of belief. After the verdict he made a statement which read in part:

We have utterly failed to draw from the court a statement of any standard of orthodoxy, but this failure is our greatest triumph,

because it was our contention from the outset that it could not be done.

We were told only that the doctrine is contained, though not formulated, in the prayer book, in the collects, in the Scriptures. So, doubtless, it is contained in the dictionary. Had they assumed to formulate it, we would still ask: What is the unalterable and immutable mental content which the words must symbolize for all men and for all time?

Judged by literalism, I am a 100 per cent heretic. By the same standard no Bishop of this Church is 100 per cent orthodox. The court, of course, failed to inform us what degree of deviation literal orthodoxy is permitted for membership in the House of Bishops. The inference is that one may be very liberal so long as no Bishop is shocked thereby.

And he really seems to have made out his case. Bishop Brown's attitude is no different *in kind* from that of every other member of the Protestant Episcopal Church. No doubt this statement will startle some, and will be indignantly denied by others, but let us see if it be not so.

Time was when I was an archdeacon in the Episcopal Church. I believed at that time practically every article of the Catholic Faith as I hold it today, and I endeavored to see that it was taught the people over whom I presided. The clergy in my district did not always teach just as I did, and I soon found that there was no authority in my Church which had set forth or could set forth my beliefs as of any more obligation than theirs. My former teacher Dr. Kinsman, when Bishop of the Episcopal diocese of Delaware believed in the Catholic theory of Holy Orders, and that the orders he conferred were being conferred in a Catholic sense, but when he sought the opinion of his fellow-bishops he discovered that there was "no special theory attached" to Anglican orders, and that no authority existed in Anglicanism which could supply him with such a theory. And so long as he and I stayed where we were our cases were parallel to that of Bishop Brown. It happened that we believed in the Catholic religion but we believed it only because we interpreted Anglican formularies in a Catholic sense. Bishop Brown says he believes in the same things in which we believed, viz.: Anglican formularies, but he believes them in a sense all his own, saying "I accept every supernaturalistic utterance in the Scriptures symbolically, not literally." Who was right? On the Protestant principle of private interpretation there is no telling. Dr. Kinsman and I found a basis for our belief in an infallible Church, divinely founded, divinely guided, protected from the possibility of error, so that it can in no wise lead us astray. And others, and they are many, who think as we thought, can do no less than we did if they are honest with themselves, and desire to have other than an individualistic standard, and thus escape heresy, for the essence of heresy is the choosing of one's own path, and the setting up of one's own self as final arbiter of the truth. The heresy of Bishop Brown has shown the fundamental heresy of all Protestantism. If he shall have awakened those in his communion who earnestly wish to be Catholics to this fact, he will have done the cause of true religion an exceedingly great service.

International Aspects of Alcohol

CAPTAIN ELBRIDGE COLBY

THE problem of Prohibition must be approached from an international point of view. Merely national legislation will not furnish that complete corrective that is needed to remove alcoholic drink. The individual nation may enact laws, yet those laws will be difficult of enforcement so long as there are places beyond the borders to which drinkers may go and maintain—even though intermittently, their habits of drink, and from which liquors may be surreptitiously shipped into the "dry" areas.

What we need, if the Prohibition movement is to succeed, is an international awakening to the necessity of an international doctrine on the subject. France may banish absinthe; Russia may outlaw vodka; Turkey may denounce all spirits; the United States may have its Eighteenth Amendment and its Volstead Act, still these are but isolated instances, and there is yet no principle of international legislation on the subject. No one nation, no three or four nations, can change the law of nations. All nations, or at least all the leading nations of the world, must concur, else international law cannot be said to exist on any particular point in question.

Now it happens that this international law is a very curious thing. It is based to some extent upon treaties; it is evidenced to a great degree by the writings of publicists; but it is only enforced by the so called municipal laws of the separate nations, or at least chiefly so. International law is not the "Law of Nature" which some believe it to be. It is not the moral standard which some would wish it to be. It is not even always uniformly interpreted in different places. Today we must admit, as Ward admitted in 1795:

Even in the same part of the globe there have been very different sorts of law of nations, according as revolutions have taken place in the religion, system of morality, and local institutions of the nations which compose it.

We in the United States may have enacted laws on the subject, but they are of no value in an international sense.

Do not mistake me, I do not refer to the common difficulties in the enforcement of Prohibition. I do not merely mean that so long as we had only "local option" in certain States, the nearby towns which sold whiskey and gin would have trails worn across their boundaries even more broad and marked than those which Emerson said the world would beat to the door of the man who could build a phenomenal mouse trap or preach an exceptional sermon. I do not merely mean that so long as some States were "dry" and others not, the liquor would continue to come out of Kentucky and into Georgia, out of New Hampshire and into Maine. I do not merely mean that when this inter-State commerce was somewhat abated by federal legislation and "bone dry" laws—so

long as Canadian rum runners may come from Winnipeg, and Toronto and Montreal, so long as Nassau and Bimini continue in British control, so long as "rum fleets" may anchor with impunity beyond the three-mile limit off Narragansett Pier and off the Jersey shore, the United States can never be dry in any actual sense. Such an assumption may be true or it may be false. If Canada were incorporated into the United States, if the British and French West Indies were acquired by purchase or otherwise—and neither of these events is likely—the difficulty would still remain. It is a legal difficulty. It exists because there is not yet an accepted doctrine of international law in conformity with the doctrine of the Government of the United States.

We must, then, confront the proposition before us squarely. In his famous opinion to the Secretary of the Treasury, under date of October 6, 1922, the Attorney General of the United States said:

A glance at contemporary history and the conditions of affairs out of which the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment arose compels the admission that it represents the culmination of fifty years' struggle of the American people to settle effectively the problems arising from the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage. Beginning by county, and State by State, the area wherein the manufacture, sale and possession of intoxicants were made illegal grew until by the ratification by forty-five of the forty-eight States of the Union an amendment affirming and extending such prohibition was added to our Federal Constitution. The intent of Congress in proposing the wording of the amendment, and of the States in ratifying it, was . . . to extend its inhibitions where the judicial arm of this Government extended for any purposes.

In a strictly legal sense, therefore, we find that Prohibition is the rule in the United States, in the territory subject to its jurisdiction, and on all American ships on the high seas. The law is an American law. The principle is an American principle. It is not yet a principle of international law, for it is a well accepted doctrine that, as was once said by the Federal Court of Appeals in the *Case of the Resolution*, "the municipal laws of a country cannot change the law of nations." And on the question of Prohibition the law of nations is silent, and by that silence gives consent.

That is the situation today. Prohibition is a national fact. It is not as yet an international fact. Therein we may see our difficulties; and therein we may see our duty.

The first of our difficulties lies in the fact that, once we envisage Prohibition as an international rather than as a simply national issue, we enlarge the field in which our activities must be carried on. Although it is international law which we seek to create in this instance, although it is not only national sentiment, which we seek to create, we must deal with each particular nation in the world. We must discover methods of approaching, of appealing to, and of convincing peoples of variant languages, divergent customs, and various types of government. Before their diplomats will go beyond their frontiers and commit

June 28, 1924

A M E R I C A

253

their sovereign States to new practises and new principles, there must be built up in these numerous nations a body of public opinion in favor of the international acts, agreements, protocols, conventions, or treaties upon which the new international law will some day rest. The theory of Prohibition must be made consonant with and fitted into the dominating currents of social and economic life lest by political reverses the returning plenipotentiaries find their negotiations repudiated and the documents to which they have agreed relegated to the limbo of unratified international acts. We would not wish to see other senates, governed by other irreconcilables, refuse to approve what had been accepted as sound and just by their statesmen and envoys. We would not wish to see, in this matter, repetitions of the common inadequacy of the resolutions so piously passed by successive Pan-American Conferences. Each nation of the world must be made ready. Each nation must be favorably prepared to see Prohibition included on the agenda. The task will be complicated. It will take time. It will take effort. But it is essential, or premature attempts will result in downright disappointments.

The second difficulty lies in the fact that the very basis and foundation of a world-wide Prohibition campaign is also the basis and foundation of opposing elements. The civilization of the modern world is absolutely dependent upon ease of communication, upon ease of transportation, upon ease of international intercourse. These very things which are so essential to any world-wide Prohibition also aid the enemies of Prohibition. If these things permit us to transcend national boundary lines in attempting to make our doctrine internationally effective, they also permit our critics to cross the boundary in the opposite direction. They cross it with propaganda. They cross it with material supplies of illegal merchandise. They send their ships to our very doors; they entice our citizens to their own shores for a "holiday" now and then; maintain their former habits and draw invidious comparisons between their happiness and ours. The constant stream of commerce from nation to nation, the speedy ocean liners passing rapidly from continent to continent, the territorial propinquity of foreign possessions, all these deny the possibility of isolation. As a nation we are today in the same position with respect to the world as the "local option" county was, several years since, to the other counties of the State, as the "dry" State was to the other States in the Union. Our principles may be right; but we are in the minority. Our laws may be sound; but we are not isolated from nations with contrary laws which their citizens deem equally sound. Our enforcement is not perfect, because we cannot prevent our citizens from leaving our jurisdiction to evade our laws, or even prevent smugglers from invading our territory with prohibited goods, so long as there are other neighboring jurisdictions with contrary legislation. Modern commercial intercourse makes modern civilization. Yet modern commerce

in a perverted form helps to undermine the efficacy of our national Prohibition and make the more necessary an international acceptance of the prohibition policy.

We stand alone against the world. The situation would be discouraging were it not for our past history and our present reputation. Usually when a single nation desires the international acceptance of laws and principles which she alone approves, her efforts are likely to be ineffective. In law, of course, her pronouncements will be invalid as regards the other nations. She would be in the position of a minority of one on a bench of learned justices. Nevertheless, even the lone judge may render a dissenting opinion, and dissenting opinions have been known to become, like the stone rejected of the builder, the very essence of future law. If the facts be consonant with the doctrine and the reasoning be sound, future investigations and thorough scrutiny will bring the truth to light. This is the history of the Prohibition movement in the United States. There is no reason why it may not also be the history of the Prohibition movement in the world.

The people of the United States have adopted Prohibition for themselves, because they believed it proper on moral and ethical grounds. There is no reason why we should not interest ourselves in Prohibition as an international affair. "Domestic policy and foreign policy," says John Bassett Moore, probably the greatest living authority on international law, "are seldom wholly diverse, and foreign policy is in the main profoundly influenced by local interests and ideals." We have stood for the rights of neutrals in time of war. We have stood for the freedom of the seas. We have stood for international arbitration. We have stood for the doctrine of voluntary expatriation. We have stood for the practise of non-intervention. We have met resistance from other nations, but have remained true to our principles. We have been able by the propriety and justice of our ideas to convince other nations that our stand was correct. The instructions issued in 1863 to our armies in the field marked a great advance in the laws of war, an advance which the rest of the world has recognized and practically adopted as international law. Our motives in entering the World War of 1914-1918 and the manner in which we withdrew therefrom without territorial aggrandizement or financial indemnities have been highly lauded by competent and distinguished men of other countries. In the development of decent government and of decent international law, we occupy an enviable position. The opinions of the American people are respected the world over. We may today be in the minority in our view of the value of Prohibition; but we are a powerful minority. No other nation on earth will be heard so attentively as we. If there ever is to be included in the canon of international law any provision regarding the advisability of Prohibition as a world-wide fact and the necessity of Prohibition as a part of the normal responsibility of sovereign states, the United States can most aptly propose such action.

After the Crusade—What?

R. DANA SKINNER

IT is only four short years since we returned from a crusade, filled with the conviction that something new had entered into American life. Yet the days through which we are now plunging are as tortuous and tortured as any in our history. We are still casting about for a symbol of deliverance. To me, at least, that symbol and a seed of prophesy may be found in the Cathedral of Notre Dame.

From a small patch of vacant ground, edging the river Seine on the north and the ancient church of St. Julien le Pauvre on the south, you catch a unique glimpse of Notre Dame. There you see not alone the guardian towers, rising through the late afternoon mists of Paris, but likewise the great buttresses ranged in majestic perspective. You see aspiration projecting from the rocks. So far as I know, this is the only point from which you grasp the unity of the cathedral, and with it, a sense of the mystery of its creation. For the Gothic was a new and somewhat astounding thing which sprang from the soil of France almost overnight, the aftermath of the Crusades.

That is why we take Notre Dame as a symbol of the mysterious workings underneath our American life today. Contrast the France of 1260 with America of 1924. The differences are too obvious, too insistent, too overpowering to demand measurement or close analysis. We lack one religious Faith, we lack the persistent impulse to philosophy, to powerful synthesis or to inspired unity of action which built the glory of the thirteenth century. And we simply are not French. We think with less precision, we start our work with more enthusiasm, perhaps, but complete it with less tenacity, with less patience, with less devotion to detail and less love of craftsmanship. We often seek our inspirations from without, where the French draw them from within. Yet transcending these differences, we do find ourselves today in a position not wholly unlike thirteenth century France. For we have also returned from a Crusade. And we set forth on that Crusade barbarians.

Barbarians—yes, in this sense: that we were a mixed race, interpenetrated with the blood of a score of older nationalities, welded together only in the common task of surmounting material obstacles, subduing nature, sharpening our wits against the stones of circumstance and achieving a political independence. We had not forged a national soul, a national intellect, nor a national art. We had national vision, but small national insight. In these ways we were barbarians. And to this extent were we like France before Urban II preached the quest of the Sepulcher to distracted Europe. France was still a Roman

province in soul, a country teeming with foreign bloods, abounding with vague energies, suppressed creative forces and challenged by an ominous restlessness.

Then, in 1096 the manhood of France first rode eastward to Palestine. It caught the vision of the minarets of the Orient. It saw the mirage of the past glories of Byzantium. It encountered something older, more mature than itself, a civilization that had once found its own soul. What is more, these thousands of young Frenchmen were acting under a common inspiration, their emotions tuned to a keenly receptive pitch, so that the scenes and the wonders and the agonies they beheld entered deeply into them and took root.

When the crusade was over, and these men returned, they became the leaven of barbarian France. Scattering to their cities, their castles and their farms, they bore, each one in his breast, the seed of new and unified achievement. Within sixty-five years of their return, something mystical and of rare beauty arose from the French soil, marking the end of the great Roman road and the frontier of the new France. It was the first portion of the cathedral of Notre Dame, a concept of religious fervor wrought in stone such as no man had witnessed or dreamed before. The Gothic became the symbol of the discovered soul of France.

Seven hundred and fifty years later, the barbarian New World—still in soul a province of Europe—sent forth nearly 2,000,000 of its strongest manhood to an older civilization, men acting under common inspiration, eagerly receptive, most of them meeting one another for the first time, Italians rubbing shoulders with Greeks or Hungarians, Irish with Scandinavians or Poles, all Americans in citizenship and in material civilization, yet without a national soul.

It is possible that they found this soul in Flanders, in Luxembourg, in Alsace, in the forest of the Argonne, or passing beneath the Gothic towers of Rheims, Chartres and Notre Dame. They are back now—four short years only—and it is still too soon to say that each has brought with him the seed of a new inner development to American life. But I do think that in the vision of Notre Dame, particularly in that imposing perspective from St. Julien le Pauvre where it stands as the symbol of all France, we have a vista of realities that may be shaping themselves under the turbulent surface of American life.

Not that we are apt to copy anything we have seen or heard or dimly felt. Notre Dame itself is no copy of the Sultan's mosques, or of the Church of Constantine. Hitherto we have copied. That has been the blatant evi-

dence of our provincial or barbarian state. We have invented new mechanical contrivances only to turn them to the service of copying. When we wanted to sublimate a skyscraper, we copied and elongated a cathedral tower. When we invented all-steel railroad cars, we painted the insides to resemble grained mahogany. When the use of steel and concrete opened up new architectural possibilities, we could think of nothing better than to copy designs created for the limitations of marble and granite. We imported our opera and music; and our literature, with rare exceptions, was photographic. We exalted into genius the amiable talent of a William Dean Howells in giving precise and objective glimpses of New England life or of the gentle comedies of a Pullman car or the Albany depot!

If the new crusade has fertilized our inner creative powers, it is certain that we shall no longer copy in this fashion. Unsettlement has prepared the way. We have new economic conditions. We are incessantly driven to new expedients in order to release creative art from the bondage of high costs. Particularly is this true in architecture. The hope of the next fifty years is that we shall come to grips with the new mechanical possibilities we possess and use them to bring forth new designs and new monuments to reflect the mystery of our inner development. We cannot hope to achieve a modern Notre Dame because only the supreme unity of religious Faith can yield such a product of devotion and love and courage. But we can, I think, look to a visible expression, something as unheard of as the Gothic before 1096, of the new impulse deep in the hearts of the returned thousands, once united during a sublime moment in the heart of Europe, and now scattered throughout our cities and farms. They are the leaven, though quite unconsciously. In the sordid reaction of today, they might even laugh to scorn the notion of their special mission. But it is only four short years since they returned. It took the men of France sixty years—and a living Faith—to achieve the vision of Notre Dame.

Four British Law Lords and Three Little Irish Girls

E. SACUNTINUS

THE pinnacle of human sagacity, that fifth essence of the spirit of justice which moves and permeates the English common law—the House of Lords has favored the world with another revelation of its consummate ability to reach eminently just conclusions. The law-lords, that is, the ex-judges and ex-chancellors in Lords, have rendered a decision which ought to provide much food for thought for some of the Anglophilic laymen and even ecclesiastics, high and low, who seem lately to be purring with such contentment in the Catholic Church in this and other countries.

The case is that of Ward vs. Laverty, and the reader who is interested in learning its full details can acquaint himself with them in the London *Times* of May 7, 1924, page 5, column 5. The litigation arose over three children of a mixed marriage in his Majesty's most loyal and united kingdom of Northern Ireland. Both parents died within a short time of each other. There had been the usual understanding regarding the Catholic training of the children; and the Catholic parent's dying injunction had been that the children be raised as Catholics. The eldest child, however, came under the control of the non-Catholic, or rather atrabiliously anti-Catholic, relatives; whereupon the Catholic relatives went to law, in order to enforce the intent of the marriage contract and dying wish of the longer-surviving parent. The case dragged as only British justice, or ought we say, Anglo-Celtic justice, can drag, and at length, early in this year, reached his Majesty's law-lords, the finest fruit of the most wonderful legal system that man has ever known. Four of the best specimens of this finest fruit heard and decided the case: Lord Cave, who condescended not long since, to visit us exuding amiable sophistries, even as far west as St. Louis, Lord Finlay, venerable dispenser of his Majesty's benign justice, and member of the Permanent Court of International Justice, and Lords Atkinson and Sumner.

Lord Cave decided, the other Law Lords concurring, that the eldest child was now too old to be taken from her non-Catholic relatives; if she were now transferred to Catholic surroundings *and instruction* she would, no doubt, lose all religion. It was better, the eminent jurist felt he might venture to state without contradiction, that she should have her Protestant faith than grow up indifferent to belief of any sort. He thought, too, that much weight should attach to the conclusion of the judge of the court of first instance, that the little girl, with whom this judge had himself talked, was a bright and intelligent child, quite attached to her Protestant worship! Of course, there was an understanding between the parents, on the matter, and a final wish of the parent who had lived the longer, to be overcome; but the circumstances, His Lordship felt impelled to point out, had made their observance impracticable. Moreover, it would be deplorable to separate the younger children from the older girl, and so he affirmed the lower court's decision, and turned the entire family over to the non-Catholic relatives!

The world heard a great deal between 1914 and 1917 about British regard for the inviolability of treaties, and British zeal for the sacredness of contracts. Our law schools—including many law schools attached to Catholic educational institutions of learning—have for more than a quarter of a century heard uttered within their classrooms an infinitude of praises of the marvelous courts of law and equity that Great Britain has developed. Our Bar Association is very shortly going to saturate itself in the spirit of the British legal system at the latter's very source. So, clearly this decision of his Majesty's law-

June 28, 1924

lords must be excellent law, and finely-perceived equity. You see, this marriage understanding which some obscure internal regulations of the Romanist persuasion imposes, is not, after all, a valid contract, when scrutinized in the clear light of British justice. Of course not; not at all! If it were, you know, why, *of course* a British court would uphold it. To be sure! So, directly you establish that the paper was a mere formality, a mere conventional and revocable concession of the non-Catholic parent to the importunities of an obstinate spouse. Why, naturally the whole thing falls to the ground. Now, doesn't it? As for the dying injunction of the Catholic parent, of course, that is of no consequence, when you take into consideration the great British principle of keeping the family together, and inculcating sound religious principles of some sort.

The next Anglo-American case-book on contracts our law professors grind out ought to start with the opinion of the Law LL. in "Ward vs. Laverty," May, 1924. Indeed, compilers of case-books on private and public international law might use its admirable dicta to drive home the point as to the inviolability of contract whether between individuals or between states. Compilers of civics catechisms for D. A. R.'ters and editors of Klipsheets for Klansmen should unfurl the doctrine in this "leading case," to use the common law jargon, across the tops of their title pages. For it proves beyond cavil that no contract with a Catholic amounts to anything, if you can only get it before a British court, or any court, for that matter, which measures justice in the scales of the British system of law.

COMMUNICATIONS

The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department.

The Catholic Quadracentenary

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I was much interested in AMERICA's articles relative to the Huguenot celebration. Mr. Henry Newman's idea of "The Catholic Quadracentenary," as expressed in his communication, under that heading in AMERICA for April 26, and also Mr. O'Connell's suggestion of March 29 seem to me a delightful scheme for obtaining some kind of recognition from the "100 per cent Americans" of our having done something after all for our country. I would be glad to contribute my usual small quota towards any fund for the Quadracentenary. I believe we owe it to our religion to demonstrate what Catholicism has always meant.

I am of Huguenot descent on my grandfather's side, but we are prouder of his conversion three years before his death than we are of his ancestors' heresy.

Blois, France.

M. F. Frith.

Senator Sherman and Catholicism

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Having read only the *Literary Digest's* excerpts from the Rev. Paul J. Blakely's article in AMERICA on the prejudice against Catholics as presidential material, I may be doing Father Blakely an injustice. Nevertheless, he is quoted as saying: "As far as I know, no Catholic has ever been seriously considered as a candidate for the Presidency." Was not the late Senator Sherman, brother of the General, a Catholic? And was he not very seriously

considered—to the point of nearly being given the nomination—by the Republican National Convention that finally nominated Garfield? My father, Andrew John Kauffman, an Episcopalian, was a delegate to that convention and one of the "Grant 306"; but I remember his admiration for Senator Sherman among Grant's opponents.

It may not be inappropriate for me to add that, as an American of the sixth generation, though not of your communion—being, in fact, a member of the Orthodox Church—I should regard the undeniable prejudice against a Catholic President as an amusing exhibition of ignorance, were it not for the sad truth that it is also, considering the proportion of Catholic voters, a glaring injustice. We have had two Catholic Chief Justices of the United States Supreme Court, and the nation somehow still endures!

Geneva, Switzerland.

REGINALD WRIGHT KAUFFMAN.

[Senator John Sherman, referred to by Mr. Kauffman, was not a Catholic.—Ed. AMERICA.]

Why Not a New York Catholic Daily?

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Why not a Catholic daily paper for Catholic New York? True, we have some excellent weeklies and monthlies but they do not quite supply the need that exists.

Why should it not be possible for our business men and women to purchase at the newsstands for perusal on their daily journeys by subway, a Catholic daily paper?

Such a paper need not be devoted exclusively to religious matters—though these should not be omitted—nor need it be confined to matters of purely Catholic interest but should provide an interesting presentation of current events at home and abroad and of the vital happenings and issues that demand the serious consideration of intelligent citizens. These matters are undoubtedly put before us ably and attractively in some of our Catholic weeklies and monthlies but the number of readers these latter reach is, I am inclined to believe, comparatively small. I, for instance, have met intelligent young Catholic business women who did not even know that these magazines were in existence, and these same young women were born and have lived in New York City and its vicinity. Our young people are highly intelligent and it is a sad spectacle to see them morning after morning feeding their minds upon the sensational and cheap—to put it mildly—ingredients which make up a large portion of our daily news sheets.

If a Catholic daily paper were available, I feel certain it would have the support of our people. There certainly are wide scope and unlimited possibilities for such a venture. It would exercise a noble apostolate among our young people by giving them a knowledge of and instruction upon important matters and vital questions which they do not always possess. It would introduce to them the best magazines, books, plays, etc., while eliminating much of the present day material, the perusal of which makes them neither better nor happier.

Nowadays a very appreciable portion of each day has perforce to be spent on train or ferry, and as in these days everybody reads, it is here the Catholic daily would serve a useful purpose. Let us hope that the day is not far distant when we shall be able to supply ourselves with a Catholic daily on our way to train or ferry and when our young men and women may have worthier fare with which to regale the passing hour or hours than is at present available.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

EMILY MOYLAN.

The Old-Time Hymns

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have just read Eugene Weare's inimitable letter, entitled, "A Wandering Minstrel's Fate," in AMERICA of June 7. It brought me across the long years a clear glimpse of the days when I knelt, a curly-headed little lad, in a rough wooden box

June 28, 1924

AMERICA

257

of a church on a rocky hillside, and listened to that same hymn, with all the intense appreciation of simple and beautiful music which I had from a thousand years of Celtic descent.

What has become of all the simple old hymns? It seems to me that they did more to fasten the childish attention upon religion and all that belongs to religion, than the showy music of today can ever do. There was another song which began:

Hail, Heavenly Queen;
Hail, foamy Ocean Star!

Perhaps I am not quoting quite correctly; so many years have rolled by since I last heard it.

Last winter I entered a great cathedral which is somewhat noted for difficult and showy music; which is all right no doubt in its place. To my delight, one of the priests had just organized a choir of children; and nothing could be sweeter, and nothing more conducive to devotion, than to hear those fresh young voices singing:

To Jesus' heart all burning,
With fervent love for men.

Let the lyric tenors and the bird-like sopranos do their part in due time and place, but cannot we have the old simple hymns back again?

North Sydney, Nova Scotia.

R. F. PHALEN,
Editor the Casket.

John Furey: Model Catholic Naval Officer

To the Editor of AMERICA:

By the death of Commander John Furey, U.S.N. (retired), at his residence in Brooklyn, on June 11, AMERICA loses one of its original subscribers and ever enthusiastic admirers, and Catholic Brooklyn one of the last links with the founders of that now great diocese. Commander Furey was born on January 6, 1836, within sight of the great Navy Yard which was the scene of so many years of his professional career. His father, James Furey, was a leader among the seventy Catholic families who in 1822 organized St. James, the first Catholic congregation on Long Island. His mother, Elizabeth Stewart, was a convert who had become a Catholic after marriage. Her gentle, lovable, amiable character was reproduced in the traits that made her distinguished son so affectionately esteemed by a circle of friends that was international in extent and inclusive of three generations. He went to school to one of the old fashioned Irish schoolmasters who were local institutions in his boyhood, and during his maturer years was fortunate enough to become the protege and helper of the famous Rev. Dr. Charles Constantine Pise in St. Charles Borromeo's parish. When the Civil War began he was a clerk in the Treasury Department in Washington and by the accident of environment was brought into almost daily contact with President Lincoln, about whom he had a wealth of interesting anecdotes. In 1863 there was a demand for staff officers in the Navy, so he volunteered, was commissioned in the paymasters' corps and served in that branch of the service until he was retired as pay inspector in 1906 on account of physical disability incidental to his duties. During the Civil War he specially distinguished himself as signal officer in both engagements at Fort Fisher and in leading an attack on Fort Caswell. His tours of shore duty included a number of years at the Annapolis Naval Academy; the Training School at Newport, which he helped to organize with Admiral Luce; and several assignments to the Brooklyn Navy Yard. At all these important posts he was ever active in looking after the spiritual care of the sailors, always setting them the personal example of a zealous, practising Catholic. He was largely instrumental in having a regular Mass celebrated on the receiving ship at the Brooklyn Navy Yard and in the appointment of the first Catholic Chaplain in the Navy by President Cleveland. His sea duty took him all around the world and supplied him with an endless fund of anecdotes and reminiscences. During a stay on the Mediterranean station he had several audiences with Pope Leo

XIII, who was much interested in his descriptions of the Catholic contingent of the American Navy.

For the U. S. Catholic Historical Society's *Record and Studies* he compiled with much care as to details a biographical list of the notable Catholic officers of the U. S. Navy, and contributed the article on Commodore John Barry to "The Catholic Encyclopedia."

Brooklyn. T. F. M.

A Real Sesqui-Centennial

To the Editor of AMERICA:

While you Gothamites were napping and allowed the Calvinistic Walloon "historical" myth to be put over on you, as the Rev. Dr. F. J. Zwierlein so forcefully outlined recently for the readers of AMERICA, here at the cradle of our national existence we have been preparing for a real Sesqui-centennial.

At the meeting of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, held on the evening of June 17, this resolution was unanimously endorsed:

Whereas, the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick of Philadelphia was organized in 1771; and

Whereas, among its members were those who won Immortality as signers of the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas, to vindicate and make successful the claim for liberty expressed in that Sacred Document and Charter of Human Rights, the entire membership of The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick rallied and so helped to establish the Republic of the United States; and

Whereas, the memory of the sacrifices and achievements of these mighty dead should not be forgotten,

Be it therefore resolved: That the President of the society be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a committee with full power to act, to arrange for, and to hold, during 1926, a memorial celebration to commemorate our ancient membership and so give renewed life and vigor to those great American principles of civil and religious liberty whose triumph the founders of our society believed they had forever established when their fellow member, George Washington, was unanimously elected the first President of the Republic of the United States.

In a letter written by Washington's adopted son, George Washington Parke Custis, discovered and made public not long since, that venerable patriot said:

Civil & Religious Liberty & the principles of the Revolution, were instilled in my mind in my infancy in the sacred shades of Mount Vernon, they have grown with my growth and strengthened with my strength, up to the close of my Seventy-sixth year, will continue to be cherished as the proudest feelings of an American heart, during my few remaining years, and only depart from me, when I shall depart for worlds unknown.

The American People have forgotten the great principles of the Revolution, for which their fathers fought & bled, in "The Times that tried men's souls," & introduced in modern times bigotry & intolerance, where all should be kindliness & brotherly love.

The times are ripe now for a general crusade that will teach a return to the principles of the founders of the Republic. Philadelphia.

R. J. M.

A Census of the Catholic Population

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Father Kenny, S.J., has again started the guessing as to the number of Catholics in these United States, by his interesting comments on the topic in AMERICA. Our local paper here, the *Transcript* does not seem to agree with his conclusions. My experience in the draft and other drives prompts me to suggest that a conclusive result could be arrived at, if a real census were only taken. The ordinary experience I think has been that when a Catholic census is ordered it is not only done in a very unscientific and impracticable way as to methods, but it is usually availed of to take up a parish collection. Of course it is a shocking unorthodox admission to record, but this last incident is fatal for the desired exact statistical total. 'Tis true, 'tis a pity, but 'tis so as the experienced know.

New Haven

L. B. P.

AMERICA

A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1924

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, GERALD C. TREACY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Address:

Suite 4847, Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Murray Hill 1635

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

A copy of the index for Volume XXX of AMERICA will be mailed to any subscriber on application to the publication office, Grand Central Terminal, New York City.

Vacation Duties

DURING the next few months the call of mountain and stream and sounding surge will be strong. Some of us will enjoy a vacation. Others will only spend their vacation at a summer resort. And other some will remain at home and continue to moil in their accustomed fields of labor.

Vacation, as the philologist will explain, implies the notion of time and leisure. It means to have time to be engaged with something, whether the something be play, piety, or painting. But for most of us, whose leisure throughout the year is for work only, vacation means a change of scene, amusement, as little work as befits a Christian, pleasant company, and a feeling that we may sleep as late as we wish without neglecting a pressing duty.

A vacation of this kind is a splendid investment. Life as it is lived in these United States is not so much an existence as a strenuous occupation. We live hard and we work fast, and the only machine we fail to care for is what Hamlet called "this machine." Even a Ford would rebel under the treatment most of us give ourselves. Thus do we spindles and dessicate, in body and, especially, in mind. We know nothing of the poetry of life, which indeed may be a poor thing, but not without its use in making the wheels of being revolve without an excess of friction. Birds, we think, are things they have in cages at the Zoo. Butterflies are small ornaments painted in fans. Stars are the bright points you used to see in the sky at night when you were a boy. A brook is a channel for carrying off waste. The sea is a large body of water

indispensable to commerce. Its average depth is 10,000 feet. The world is indeed too much with us. It is well to get away from its purely physical aspects. We need a change from time to time, a vacation.

The essence of a vacation, then, is a change of environment. But let the change be not absolute. Even during vacation we are Christians, with the duties of Christians, and the natural law and the decalogue hold during Summer as well as throughout the other months of the year. It is a poor sort of vacation, which has no time for daily prayer, for the Sunday Mass, for the regular reception of the Sacraments, for kindness and for sacrifice.

The Ruler of Our Souls

UNPLEASANT in some respects, the publicity given the case of Bishop Brown of the Protestant Episcopal Church will probably do much good. While it offered every paragrapher in the country an opportunity to rehearse the old gibes against religion, it also brought home to many serious-minded men and women the necessity of an infallible guide in Faith and morals.

Bishop Brown claimed that he accepted the Scriptures and the Prayer Book with all that they "taught," but insisted upon his right to interpret them in his own sense. It need hardly be said that since Dr. Brown cited the Bible to prove that there is no God, no Creator, no Saviour, and no responsibility save such as every man may accept for himself, the ecclesiastical court could do nothing but sustain the indictment. On the other hand, the Bishop's attorney was fully justified in asking where he or anyone else could find an adequate statement of what was taught and what condemned by the Protestant Episcopal Church. In his opinion, the court was attempting to condemn Dr. Brown for deviating from a creed and code which it was unable or unwilling to make known. Addressing the Bishops who constituted the court he said:

I challenge anyone of you to take this chair and state the doctrine of the church. All eight of you could do it, and at the end we would have eight different interpretations of doctrine. What justice are you giving a man when you try him for errors of doctrine which you cannot agree upon yourselves.

Technically the court was within its rights in ruling that Dr. Brown, not the court was on trial. But what of the attorney's challenge? Had the gauntlet been thrown before a company of Bishops of the Catholic Church, it would have been taken up instantly. "The doctrine of the Church" could have been stated easily by Bishop Schrembs of Cleveland, the city in which the trial was held, by Cardinal Hayes of New York or His Eminence of Chicago; by the Primate at Westminster or by a missionary Bishop in Alaska or Tierra del Fuego; by any Bishop in communion with the See of Peter in any part of the world. What the Catholic Church teaches is no secret. She is a city set on a hill that all men may see.

So it must needs be. If our Divine Lord has com-

manded all men to accept His teaching under peril of their eternal salvation, men must be able to know what that teaching is. Christ did not entrust His message to a fallible teacher. He founded a visible Church to which He gave all authority, sustaining it in truth by His abiding presence until the end of time. That Church proclaims Him to all the world, fearlessly condemns all deviations from His doctrine, chastises her children lay or clerical should they depart from it, and with the authority of her Founder which is the authority of God Himself binds and looses the souls of men.

The Physician and the Bottle

PROHIBITION again made its appearance at the annual convention of the American Medical Association when a resolution calling for a revision of the Volstead law was adopted. The physicians represented by the Association are modest in their demands. After observing that alcohol is necessary in the treatment of certain diseases, they point out that its use is limited by the law, "regardless of the condition of the patient," that under present conditions, to obtain unadulterated alcohol, is very difficult and sometimes impossible, and that the system of reporting required under the law violates the confidential relations which should exist between patient and physician. Hence the Association pledges itself to make every legitimate effort to obtain the repeal of those sections of the Volstead law which "interfere with the proper relation of the physician to his patient."

Certainly what the Association proposes is not unreasonable. The resolution merely asks Congress to recede from its absurd position of treating the physician with less consideration than it would show the man about to engage in the lucrative business of bootlegging. With the constitutional aspects of the Volstead law, the physicians do not concern themselves. They might have protested that Congress is wholly unfitted to act as a medical adviser. They might have complained that under the Eighteenth Amendment Congress is given no authority whatever to write a prescription, or to forbid the physician to work for his patient as his conscience and his best judgment dictate. The Eighteenth Amendment forbids the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. Whiskey used in the treatment of a pneumonia patient, or champagne given a fever-convalescent, is in no sense of the words an intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes. But with absolute disregard of the limitations placed on it by the Amendment, Congress cringed under the whip of the Prohibition fanatics and voted a law for which no warrant can be found in the Constitution.

Yet it is a matter for wonderment why the physicians did not act before the Volstead law was adopted. The danger of an unwarranted intrusion upon the rights and dignity of the profession was clear from the outset, but the medical profession, as a whole, seemed cowed by

the fanatics. Nothing like an adequate defense was even attempted. Here and there a physician of the character of the late Dr. John P. Davin of New York, appeared at the Congressional hearings, but the men who had enough regard for the honor of the profession to defend it could be counted upon the fingers of one hand.

However belated, the protest of the physicians is welcome. It is but one of many which have appeared in the last twelve months, and is another indication of the awakening realization that the Volstead law, founded as it is upon statements contrary to fact, cannot be enforced.

The Unbalanced School

WHAT is the trouble with our boys today?" asked a prosecuting attorney, in an interview recently published in the *New York Times*. "Statistics in my office show that the average age of the male criminal is twenty years. What is the reason? I am far more interested in finding out the cause than I am in punishing the criminal."

Perhaps an answer can be found in an address made some weeks ago at a school commencement by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. James J. Davis. Instancing the case of the two Chicago youths, each a college graduate, indicted in Chicago for murder, Mr. Davis criticized the modern school for its failure to give the pupil any real training in morality. It succeeded fairly well, if by success were meant its aim to give its pupils large opportunities to acquire some knowledge of a mass of facts. But on the need of righteousness, honor, sacrifice and charity, it laid little stress, while some institutions of collegiate rank actually professed to have no definite interest in, or responsibility for, the character-formation of their students. The result was "an unbalanced education and an unbalanced mind" a man who in given circumstances might be for more dangerous to society than a lunatic at large.

Yet it is the school which is forbidden by law to train the child in religion that we are asked to accept as typically and exclusively American. In an editorial published some time ago in one of the Hearst newspapers, the utterly absurd statement was made that to injure or oppose the public school was "treason." As has been shown in these pages again and again, the public school, so far from being a "typical" American institution, is a foreign importation and a growth of recent date. The schools of the Colonies which nurtured the Fathers of the Republic were private schools and religious schools. With hardly an exception, the "typical" American school of the first generation of the Republic was a school which trained its children according to a definite religious plan. Not until nearly eighty years after the Declaration of Independence did the secular school, the work of men influenced by the pagan philosophy of France and Germany, make its appearance in the United States. If this is the "American school" then the phrase has taken on some new meaning, known only to the initiate.

Probably ninety per cent of our children are now in schools from which Jesus Christ would be excluded were He to enter to teach His saving doctrine. Not one in ten of these children ever attends a church service or is enrolled in a Sunday school. Where are they to receive any instruction in religion and morality? Today sixty per cent of our people belong neither to church nor synagogue. What will the next generation bring forth? Meanwhile the crime-rate increases and boys of twenty are sentenced to the chair or the scaffold, and through it all the cry goes up that schools in which the teaching of religion is positively forbidden are the cornerstone of the Republic.

The Bomb Thrower

THE writer of books," Chesterton remarked, "is the thrower of bombs today." He was speaking, of course, primarily to English people and of English writers. For the English people are a book reading people, and many more books are written in England than in this country. Yet the fact remains that current literature the world over has a bombing power. It starts ideas in circulation. And an idea is much more of a bomb than a mechanical instrument with an explosive fuse. A great many factors enter into the perfect working of a mechanical instrument. But once give an idea its proper setting and it will work very surely, bombing its way through the strata of human thought.

Time was indeed when the idea worked very slowly. That time has gone. Today the idea has numerous channels, the book, the magazine, the newspaper, the radio. If

it is advantaged in its source it can use all these channels. The President for example because of his position can put his idea before the whole country in a very brief period of time. An obscure citizen however has a more difficult task, for he lacks the organs of expression on a large scale. And it will always remain true that position counts for much in this bomb throwing about which Chesterton speaks. It is very interesting to note that a Catholic idea may have great bombing power if it starts from a favorable position. The Catholic idea for instance that men have inalienable rights which no Government may violate, had very little practical power in the realm of social thought until it fell into the hands of the Continental Congress. In those hands it became a bomb that shattered British autocracy in the colonies, and went careening on its way to the destruction of the very idea of autocratic government. Its bombing power is still felt in this day of fallen thrones.

It is not exaggeration to say that the combined position of teacher and textbook is the strongest in the world of ideas, for the educational forces in the nation are the real bombing forces. What the Continental Congress did for one idea the educational centers may do for all ideas. Which brings to the fore the pertinent question: What are American educational centers doing for the progress of true Americanism? Are they bombing away the dross of the false that they may build up the true? This is the Catholic ideal. Is it the common ideal of the centers of learning in the land?

Literature

A Catholic Note on Poe's "Raven"

IN the very interesting and valuable collection of autograph letters and historic manuscripts loaned from the Morgan Library, and now on exhibition at the New York Public Library, Forty-second Street and Fifth Avenue, is this letter written by Edgar Allan Poe:

Dear Shea:

Lest I should have made some mistake in the hurry I transcribe the whole alteration.

Instead of the whole stanza commencing "Wondering at the stillness broken," etc.—substitute this—

Startled at the stillness broken by reply so aptly spoken,
"Doubtless," said I, "what it utters is its only stock and store
Caught from some unhappy master whom unmerciful Disaster
Followed fast and followed faster till his songs one burden bore—

Till the dirges of his hope the melancholy burden bore,
'Nevermore—ah, nevermore!'

At the close of the stanza preceding this, instead of "Quoth the raven Nevermore," substitute *Then the bird said "Nevermore."*

Truly yours, POE.

This missive, which was folded, according to the custom of the day, and addressed: "J. Augustus Shea, Esq.,

to be delivered as soon as he comes in," was sent by Poe to his friend John Augustus Shea, one of the leaders of the Catholic literary circle of the New York of the thirties and forties. It indicates a change to be made in the text of the famous "Raven." Poe came to New York in January, 1837, and went to board at 13½ Carmine Street, which is the heart of Greenwich Village, but left for Philadelphia the following April. He came back to New York in April, 1844, going to live with his wife at 130 Greenwich Street. During his short career as a cadet at the West Point Military Academy, Poe met Shea, who was then a clerk there in the Commissary's office. Their friendship was continued in New York and from this, and other evidence, it seems that the association was intimate all during Poe's stay in the city.

The Catholic literary organ of those days was, as its title-page runs: "The Catholic Expositor and Literary Magazine, a Monthly Periodical, edited by the Very Reverend Felix Varela, D.D., and Rev. Charles Constantine Pise, D.D." and published at 151 Fulton Street. Constant contributors to its pages, in both prose and verse,

were John Augustus Shea and his literary associate of that era, Charles James Cannon, names to conjure with then, but unknown to the present generation. Shea's son was the late Chief Justice George Shea of the old Marine (now City) Court, who inherited some of his father's literary ability as his life of Alexander Hamilton shows. One of Judge Shea's daughters was Mrs. Ballastier, the wife of Rudyard Kipling's brother-in-law. Unfortunately, as in the case of the descendants of so many other pioneer Catholic families, the second generation of Sheas were sheep who wandered outside the True Fold.

Poe's Catholic associates and friends in New York were numerous. From the Greenwich Street boarding house he went out into what was then the Bloomingdale suburbs, but which is now the immediate neighborhood of the residence of the editors of AMERICA. There he was received as a boarder with the family of Patrick Brennan, whose farm of some 200 acres covered this section of the west side extending from the present western boundary of Central Park to the North River. The New York Shakespeare Society has marked by a bronze tablet on the building at the northwest corner of Broadway and Eighty-fourth Street, the approximate site of the old Brennan farmhouse. It was during his residence there, 1843-1844, that Poe finished his poem "The Raven" and it was to Patrick Brennan's daughter Martha and her mother that he first read it when he had completed it, in the room he occupied, on the second floor of the house. Miss Brennan became the wife of the late General James R. O'Beirne of Civil War fame and one of the most distinguished of the alumni of old St. John's College, Fordham. She often, according to family tradition, told the story of hearing the first version of "The Raven" and of Poe's stay in the Bloomingdale farmhouse. It was his custom, she said, to wander away from it in pleasant weather to an immense rock on the bank of the Hudson and sit for hours silently gazing out over the waters.

As noted already the literary intimacy between Shea and Poe began at West Point. Judge Shea used to relate that his father often told how persistently he had encouraged the poet's youthful aspirations. The consultations as to the structure of "The Raven" indicate that these relations were continued when Poe came to live in New York.

Shea and Poe and other kin spirits used to foregather in a resort called in the City Directory of that date "a refectory," kept by one "Sandy" Welsh, in Nassau Street, near the corner of Ann Street. They evidently had been discussing the construction of "The Raven," for Poe sent the amendment set forth in his elegant, precise, copperplate writing, every letter meticulously formed, in the note of the Morgan collection, to "Sandy's" refectory—"to be delivered as soon as he comes in," to Shea, who had undertaken the task of getting it published, in some one of the local prints under the pseudonym of "Quarles."

Shea gave it to Colton's *American Review* in which it was printed in the issue for February, 1845. This first printing, however, was anticipated in the daily edition of the *New York Mirror* of January 29, 1845, and the poem was also given in the weekly edition of the *Mirror* of February 8, prefaced with this explanation: "We are permitted to copy (in advance of publication) from the 2d No. of the *American Review* the following remarkable poem by Edgar Poe."

Thence it went out all over the world to the immortality linked to the name of its gifted but ill-starred author.

Mrs. O'Beirne and her distinguished husband were not the only members of the Brennan family who became notable in New York Catholic records. Her brother was the famous "Big Tom" Brennan, for many years Commissioner of Charities and Corrections and a prominent figure in local charitable and philanthropic movements for more than a generation. He invented for Bellevue the emergency ambulance service for hospitals now so universal, but then unknown, during his official administration of that hospital, and largely aided the founding, by Sister Irene of the Mount Saint Vincent Sisters of Charity, of New York's great Foundling Asylum, the first institution of its kind in the United States.

In 1846 Poe moved to Fordham to occupy the cottage in the Bronx to which his admirers now make pilgrimages, and where "Eureka," "Annabel Lee," "For Annie" and "Ulalume" were written. He was a constant visitor at the college nearby and loved to wander about its spacious grounds. Father Doucet and Father Thébaud of the faculty were his special friends, indeed, everything about the historic Rose Hill manor seemed congenial and sympathetic to his harried soul. There are many traditions still at Fordham University of the delight he took in meeting the old Jesuits there who made him feel so perfectly at home and welcome and who could talk to him about the interests and the topics he took pleasure in discussing.

In his recently published memoirs, the venerable Archbishop Robert Seton tells how, when he was a boy, his father often drove him over to Fordham from their country residence near Long Island Sound and that they would stop at Poe's cottage and chat with him. It was a lovely spot in those days, with a small rocky elevation crowned with cedars, overlooking a pleasant landscape with the hills of Long Island in the distance. In the old Fordham annals, it is said of him:

It was one of Poe's greatest gifts that he could make friends wherever he went. To see him was to love him. He had a charming presence, a most intellectual countenance, brilliant dark eyes, a high forehead, with the temples well developed, and a pale and sad expression of face that attracted people. His features were a trifle sharp and made up an almost typical American face. It was a pleasure to see him and still more to listen to him.

And that's what made him always a favorite guest among the Jesuit community at old St. John's College.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

TO THE PALEONTOLOGISTS

De-petal the rose for the microscope.
On the anvil place the pearl.
Cry forth the stark futility of hope.
Pronunciamientos hurl.—
Pluck out from the throats of the humming-birds
The feathery embers there;
Dissect them, and ticket with abstruse words
And great meticulous care.
You are through.—Yet can you blow back the breath
Animate? Or have you heard
All the aeon music of Life or Death,
The Infinite final word?

LILIAN W. BROWNE.

REVIEWS

Alfred E. Smith. By HENRY MOSKOWITZ. New York: Thomas Seltzer. \$3.50.

McAdoo. By MARY SYNON. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. \$3.00.

While these lines are being read, the Democratic National Convention is passing upon the merits of the subjects of these biographies as Presidential nominees. Manifestly the two books are campaign material; but they are superior to the ordinary stock of such literature and might well be regarded solely as biographies of honored public characters, except that they are too expansive of praise and too meager in criticism. The narrative of Mary Synon is the better constructed and the more artistic; she has wrung to the full the claims of Mr. McAdoo, and taken advantage of every quality and act to which praise might be attached. She says very little about his boyhood and accents only slightly his work as a young man. Quite legitimately she places full stress on his accomplishments as Secretary of the Treasury under President Wilson. At great length and with infinite detail she records his efforts and his successes, his ideals and principles, the problems that he faced and the solutions that he advocated. His work was indeed tremendous, including the establishment of the Federal Reserve, the financing of America and the Allies during the war, Liberty Loans, the Insurance Act, the Railroad Administration and innumerable other internal and international responsibilities. Of his opinions on current matters that are to be issues in the Presidential campaign, the biography is silent. From Mr. Moskowitz's study of Governor Smith emerges "Al" Smith, successful but honest, astute but straightforward, the man of and from the people but the statesman with wide vision. Mr. Smith is likewise presented on his record in the past with little space devoted to his platform save in so far as that may be gathered from his previous statements and acts. These have been mostly of a local nature but they indicate how Governor Smith would act in the larger national sphere. Quite the best thing that Mr. Moskowitz has done is to make the biography largely documentary, and to allow Governor Smith to reveal himself. From his speeches, his public statements, his official declarations, one is able to measure the man more accurately. "Drys" might well ponder his statement, fully quoted, concerning the Mullan-Gage repeal, and readers of the Hearst papers will understand him by perusing his exposure of Mr. Hearst's attacks.

F. X. T.

Thackeray and His Daughter. Letters and Journals of Anne Thackeray Ritchie with letters by William Makepeace Thackeray. Edited by HESTER THACKERAY RITCHIE. Harper and Brothers.

One may be said merely to make the acquaintance of a novelist by reading his stories. For stories are usually so objective that, although one may love an individual character as a personal friend or despise him or her as a personal enemy, the Manager

of the Performance seems always to be sitting there before the curtain and simply looking on. Acquaintance ripens into friendship, however, when the Manager himself hands you the key to his own private dwelling and beckons you to sit by the hearth while he talks of that home, of his children, of his friends, of his ambitions and achievements. Such a friendship is the fruit of the forty odd letters of Thackeray which his granddaughter has recently published. In them we admire more than ever the childlike simplicity of this great story-teller, his tenderness towards his "dear Mammy," and his devotion to his children. We rejoice with him and pity him in turn, though there is more cause for joy than for sorrow, we feel peculiar interest in his lecture tours, in the progress of his stories, in his final steps to the summit of fame.

Not less charming, except by reason of the pre-eminence that the father will always hold in the hearts of booklovers, are the letters and journals of the daughter, Mrs. Anne Thackeray Ritchie. The constant companion of her father, from her youngest years, his secretary, especially in the writing of "The Newcomes," Anny, as Thackeray called her, developed an artistic nature and a literary facility of her own. Her letters and journals, continued up to the time of her death in 1919, bespeak a singular ability in striking off characters in a few words, in describing with color earth, sky and sea, tempest and calm, music, painting, sculpture, and homelier things. She moved in the society of the eminent artists and literary men and women of the last half century. The book contains a series of interesting sketches by Thackeray, sketches used to illustrate persons and places mentioned in the letters, and several of the same nature by the authoress of the journal.

J. H. C.

The Legacy of Rome. Edited by CYRIL BAILEY. New York: American Branch, Oxford University Press. \$3.00.

Much has been said and written about our debt to Rome, but the tendency has frequently been to assume either too much or too little. The authors of the studies in this book purport to give in clear, concise form some idea of what Roman civilization was and how far it contributed to the building up of our modern civilization. On the whole we know of no book that accomplishes this purpose quite as adequately within the same compass. The topics treated are exceptionally well chosen; among these are the transmission of the legacy, the legacy itself, consisting of the conception of empire, administration, commerce, law, social life, religion, philosophy, science, literature, art, language, engineering, and agriculture. Exception might be taken to one or two points, as, for instance, when Ernest Barker would seem to argue that Roman law implies constitutionalism. He might have stated that the particular decree to which he appeals was that of a Christian emperor, Theodosius II, which was issued some twenty years after St. Augustine wrote his "De Vera Religione," where the passage occurs to which the early medieval writers appeal for their ground in principal in favor of the constitutional limitation. In several places the authors speak of the institution of the early Church as though this were an accident of historical development and not in consequence of Our Lord's divine determination. The editor himself makes one important contribution in that he marks a clear distinction between all pagan religion and philosophy and Christianity, allowing only that the former by way of preparation provided an opportunity for the formation of Christian theology.

M. F. X. M.

The American Labor Year Book, 1923-24. Volume V. New York: Rand School of Social Science. \$3.00.

This book is issued to give the statistical facts regarding labor in the United States, with a briefer review of labor conditions in other portions of the world. It is prepared by the Labor Re-

June 28, 1924

AMERICA

265

search Department of the Rand School of Social Science, a Socialist institution devoted to the promulgation of Socialist views through study courses and literature. The compilers of the book have naturally therefore given their attention largely to Socialist, Communist and similar radical movements while briefly recording in a few lines the essential data of such other organizations as the Christian Trade Unions of the various countries. The general labor movement in the United States is given in considerable detail. Usually the effort has been made to state facts in an impersonal way, but the bias is at times apparent, as when under "Russia" the Soviet falsehood is repeated that: "During 1922-23 a number of Roman Catholic priests and officials were imprisoned for treasonable activities," the treasonable activities having consisted in the teaching of Catechism and seeking to administer the Sacraments. The mistake, unfortunately too common, of speaking of the members of the Austrian Christian Social party as Christian Socialists is also made here.

J. H.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The Literary Circle.—Mr. Thomas F. Meehan, who contributes this week's article on Poe and his Catholic friends, has spent a lifetime delving into the records of Catholic achievements in the United States, and especially in the New York vicinity. For many years he was engaged in journalism, but relinquished this to serve as Associate Editor of "The Catholic Encyclopedia." He cooperated in the establishment of AMERICA and has been connected with it ever since the first issue in 1909.

. . . Writing from St. Marys, Kansas, Mr. P. J. McKenna declares "Mr. Belloc, according to his own statement, achieved quite a notable thing in writing a complete essay without once employing the conjunction 'and.' But the fact remains that he did not. Of course it could have been easily avoided in the instance I am about to mention but through the oversight of Mr. Belloc, his proof-readers and a large number of readers it has so far escaped detection. The sentence is 'You seize your moment and you say.' It would have been just as easy to turn it this way 'You seize the moment to say' or to give it some other form." Mr. McKenna concludes with the laconic reflection that the work stands as a monument to man's imperfection.

. . . A contributor complains that we failed to mention the writings of Marion Taggart when speaking of appropriate books for girls. She admonishes us "Knowing her personally I can but admire her championed cause. A mind at once brilliant and capable of coping with a 'high-brow' adult audience, she is running her energies into channels mostly for the young things to dip into. Join your voice in telling them 'The water's fine.'"

. . . The June number of the *Month* opens with a belligerent article by Father Martindale entitled "Catholic: International." Its purpose is to arouse Catholics to a proper sense of interest in regard to their coreligionists in persecuted countries. John Ashton continues his inquiry into "Why is Dean Inge Anti-Catholic." Father Thurston holds "An Interview with Bernadette of Lourdes" and Reginald J. Dingle contributes a thoughtful paper on "Joan of Arc and Modern France."

Literature of Criticism.—A literary critic lays himself open to criticism even more than does the creative artist, for the critic expresses principles while the artist conceals them. The fundamental faith that is in the critic, if his opinions are worth anything, must be phrased as plainly as a set of propositions. On this score, no complaint is to be made against Waldo Frank in his book of "Salvos" (Boni and Liveright. \$2.50). His opening salvo, "For a Declaration of War," is clear in statement;

but its basic philosophy is decadent, its theory of art is distorted and its ideals of life and literature are repugnant to the normal and noble minded. We deny, therefore, reject and condemn each chapter of the book. Thereby we classify ourselves with his "one hundred million morons" in America; nevertheless, we feel flattered. Mr. Frank is alien to American culture and detests it; his salvos are an attempt to batter it down.—The really commendable feature of "From Whitman to Sandburg in American Poetry" (Macmillan. \$2.00), by Bruce Weirick, is the clear continuity it traces out in our American tradition. It aligns in perspective the types and movements of our national poetry and gives a background to such poets as Lanier, Joaquin Miller, Moody, Riley and Field. But the perspective is not entirely true. Whitman is too highly inflated; he is made the norm by which all other poets are estimated. Accordingly Sandburg and those of his class, are dubbed authentic, while all who show relationship with the larger tradition are labeled "albuminous Victorians." Mr. Weirick touches his critical survey, here and there, with brilliance and at times gives evidence of clear perception; but he does not consider American poetry in its fullest extent.

Home Gardens.—For those who now and then like to get back to the soil, "Gardening By Myself" (Dufield. \$1.50), by Anna B. Warner, will suggest many helpful things. The amateur gardeners will find therein twelve chapters, one for each month of the year. The preface is dated 1872, but this new edition is quite interesting and up-to-date. It is well-written and the experience of years is offered to the reader.—It is the ambition of every family to own its own home; but whether to buy one ready-made, or to remodel an old one, or to have it made to order, that is the question. This is the very question that is answered in all its details in "Home Owners' Hand-book" (Scientific American Pub. Co. \$2.50). Austin C. Lescarboura, the author, gives us all sorts of practical advice in this book on house building, and in a way that the average layman can understand.

What About Government?—At this time, when the Supreme Court is the target for so many and such violent attacks, "The State of the Nation" (Bobbs, Merrill. \$3.00), by Albert J. Beveridge, is a most opportune book. With the exception of the last chapter, a paper read at the annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association on the Supreme Court, the volume is a reprint of a series of articles originally appearing in the *Saturday Evening Post*. The one note that Senator Beveridge sounds continually is that our people must realize that the hope of our Government is in the courts rather than in the legislatures, and in the Supreme Court above all. The book is markedly popular in style, and, in exposition, is detailed enough to fit an elementary class in civics.—The title given to Seba Eldridge's volume, "Political Action" (Lippincott), is not very suggestive of the contents of the book, nor is the sub-title, "The Naturalistic Interpretation of the Labor Movement in Relation to the State," much more illuminating. "Naturalistic" is here used as opposed to "Ethical," and the basic philosophy of the book seems to be materialistic evolution. There is but little directly and immediately bearing on the labor question itself, but a lengthy philosophical analysis is given of the influence exerted by the various factors more remotely operative in social and political life. These are classed under three main heads: hereditary traits and capacities, such as instincts, intellectual processes, hedonic factors and habit; the physical environment; and culture or tradition. A like abstract discussion follows on representative government. The book will probably be read most generally with the help of the copious index.

Saint Rita and Blessed Thérèse.—At the head of the list of those spiritual histories which are yet to be written, comes the romance of Umbrian medieval sainthood. The biographies of our Saints appear piecemeal as devotion demands and the splendor of Umbria's galaxy suffers from being delineated in disconnected stories. St. Rita, "the pearl precious" as Pope Leo XIII described her, is of this company and of that land. Having captivated American devotion as "Saint of the Impossible," it seems somewhat imperative that her story should again be independently told. For all who wish to read an account written with simple directness, manifest faith, and the unction of unpretending piety, we recommend the "Life of Sister St. Rita of Cascia," (Hansen), translated from the Spanish of Father Sicardo by Rev. D. J. Murphy, O.S.A.—The Rev. John P. Clark in "Her Little Way. Blessed Thérèse of the Child Jesus" (Benziger. \$1.00), seeks to extend the sphere of influence of the Little Flower by showing that simple and easy way to God, so clearly illustrated in her life. The Little Flower of Jesus simply breathed forth the fragrance of God's great love, and no reader of this short sketch of her life can fail to catch some of its sweetness. The illustrations are many and beautiful—"Shower of Roses Upon the Missions," published by the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, New York, is a compilation of spiritual and temporal favors obtained through the intercession of Blessed Thérèse, the Little Sister of the Missionaries, from 1909 to 1923. Some of the favors recounted are really astonishing. The book should have the effect of increased confidence in the intercession of the one who promised to spend her heaven in showering roses upon earth.

Solitude and Stars.—The Rev. Walter Elliott, of the Paulist Fathers, has gathered into book form, "A Retreat for Priests" (Washington: Apostolic Mission House. \$1.65), the varied experience derived from many retreats given to the diocesan clergy. These notes are divided into two parts, the first including Conferences on what are termed the Great Eternal Truths, namely, the Value of the Soul, Mortal Sin, the Lessons of Death, the Passion of Christ, and other suitable subjects; while in the second part the Priest and his various duties and obligations are treated in separate chapters. Especially helpful is the chapter on "The Priest's Holiness and the Sacrifice of the Mass." An attractive feature of this book is the brevity, yet completeness with which the reverend author has handled each subject, preferring as he does to suggest salutary thoughts rather than give an exhaustive conference. "A Retreat" will be found most helpful not only during the days of prayerful solitude, but also will afford excellent spiritual reading for the entire year.—"Stardom and Beyond" is a rather rambling collection of pious musings and anecdotes by a Priest of St. Bede's Abbey, Peru, Illinois. The collection though somewhat loosely put together, forms a very interesting whole. The preface explains the lack of unity by an appeal to St. Gregory the Great, who wrote to St. Leander, Bishop of Seville, in a letter which accompanied a gift, that "this is not only permitted, but sometimes even advisable." The result here justifies the author's decision, and the main burden of the book is the exemplification of the Christian adage: "Per aspera ad astra." The "stars" are considered as a constellation, in meridian, in eclipse, the Star of Bethlehem, the Morning Star, and Evening Star. Incidentally a great deal of interesting information is given the reader about astronomy.

Out of Doors.—Stories of outdoor life, instructions on the art of camping, in fact, everything to interest the real American boy, is found within the pages of "The Boy Scouts Own Book" (Appleton. \$1.75), edited by Franklin K. Mathews. This phase of vacation has become so very popular that such a book will be

interesting and instructive to the boys themselves, while the grownups will not find it tiresome reading. Such a book deserves a place in every boy's library.—"Camping Out. A Manual of Organized Camping" (Macmillan. \$2.00), is edited by L. H. Weir. Many books cover the camping problem from the campers' viewpoint; few, however, approach this problem from the angle of the director and his counsellors. "Camping Out" aims, and succeeds most admirably, in supplying the most practical and up-to-date information on organized camping in all its aspects, for the use of those who are now conducting summer camps, or are about to do so. The pastor of a city parish interested in starting a parish camp will find this book thought-provoking, helpful, and a ready aid to solving that very real problem—"How safeguard our children during the vacation periods?"

Catechetical.—"Religion" (Macmillan), by Rev. Roderick Mac Eachen, D.D., is now in its Fourth Course, and this latest issue is in perfect keeping with the excellence of its predecessors. This present course, among other subjects, treats of the Creation, the Seven Capital Sins, the Virtues, the Spiritual and Corporal Works of Mercy, the Sacraments, Grace and the Church. This Teachers' Edition should be in the hands of every one whose duty it is to explain the Christian doctrine.—The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore prepared and enjoined "A Catechism of Christian Doctrine" which Rev. M. V. Kelly, C.S.B., has now "Revised" (Sadlier). This revision has been done "solely with the purpose of presenting all the doctrines enunciated in the original work in the form and according to the methods advocated in schools of catechetics." The order of topics and book itself are a vast improvement over the old editions of the Baltimore Catechism.

Fiction.—Thomas Dixon has written a new-old story in "The Black Hood" (Appleton. \$2.00). As the title indicates, it is the story of the original Ku Klux Klan which was suppressed by the United States government 50 years ago. The romance is woven around a body of facts that are all recorded in the "Ku Klux Conspiracy," a government publication brought out in 1873. This novel shows in imaginative form the old truth that force creates force, that an invisible government spells ruin and anarchy, and that democratic institutions are doomed to failure once the sanctity of the courts is violated by a fanatical group. It would be well to place "The Black Hood" in the hands of the convention delegates of both parties. Indeed, every American could read it with profit.

A "thriller," typical of the magazine serial, is "Garber of Thunder Gorge" (Small, Maynard. \$2.00), by Whitman Chambers and John Mersereau. The battle for the control of a mine, a shock of wits and guns, goes on from chapter to chapter until a happy ending is secured. There is no lack of action, dialogue, and adventure in the joint production of these authors who are well known to "readers of the best fiction magazines." There is, however, some lack of the art of lasting fiction.

In "Re-Creations" (Lippincott. \$2.00), Grace Livingston Hill tells a charming story of a college girl suddenly thrust into a world of responsibility. The reformation of a wayward brother, the rehabilitation of a shattered home, the disillusionment of a lover, are accomplished by the heroine. The religious motive fundamental to the novel will be better understood by non-Catholic than by Catholic readers.

The worn-out triangle plot is worked once more in "The Perfect Wife" (Doran. \$2.00), by Phyllis Bottome. The title of the book should be "The Perfect Fool." It is a collection of improbable situations and impossible people. In the great output of inferior fiction this book should be listed at the foot of the column. Reviewers are in duty bound to read it and save thereby the unsuspecting reading public, easily led astray by titles.

June 28, 1924

AMERICA

265

Education

Wanted: A Dictator

THE Sterling-Reed attempt to nationalize the American school may reap scant consolation from the knowledge that it aims to fill an actual, a vital need. Its lustiest opponents, from State University President down to the humble nun of the parish school, are prepared to admit that our secular education is egregiously in want of a dictator, which is tantamount to saying, it wants authority. This is faint praise indeed, to say that a bill of such intricate detail and import as the Sterling-Towner bill proposal begins with a sincere aim; and, frankly, the observation is made with intent to condemn. For the sole merit of the bill ends with its intention. Let the color of our postage-stamps or the stipend for railroad-mileage rest with the Federal Government's great central machine; but the formation of our children's character let us keep close to the home, where God meant it to reside. Educational reform lies not in the direction of Washington.

Where, then, are we to turn for the authority which is admittedly the chief desideratum of the school question in our land? Where shall we find the dictator? There was a time when all organized education submitted lovingly to the dictation of a system of thought which glorified common sense and left room for religion. That system was the philosophy of the scholastics, and during the period of its ascendancy education and the arts reached the noblest heights known to their history. Today our secular schools are farther from its influence than ever before—and nearer to chaos. Because we refuse to burden our curricula with "philosophical dogma," because we have lost our faith in the eternity of truth, therefore can Mr. Zangwill call us "the greatest little half-educated people in the world," and Dr. Butler of Columbia object that even that proportion is too high!

It is not an exclusively Catholic criticism that advises us, as an answer to our school question, to place American education under the dominion of scholastic philosophy. Dr. Ralph Adams Cram is an enthusiastic advocate of salvation through scholasticism. "Towards the Great Peace" is in large measure devoted to a courageous campaign for the restoration to power of the darling of his heart, which he calls the "sacramental" philosophy of the scholastics.

Only a few months ago Dr. Meiklejohn, retiring president of Amherst, asked in the name of all educators "To Whom Are We Responsible?" (*Century*, September, 1923) and worked out the only sane reply: "We feel and acknowledge responsibility only to the truth." Equivalently, that answer clothes with authority over the pedagogue the system which regards the body of all truth as its subject-matter. Scholastic philosophy alone has ever made that arrogant boast, and sustained it.

How do we Catholics feel on the subject? Secure in the consciousness that the Church's schools are safely for-

tified with the one all-sufficing pedagogical guide, can we view with aught but pity, and alarm, the helpless gropings of education outside the Fold, which upon its own admission is the slave of fad and experiment? What scholasticism has done for us, it can do for any educator who welcomes it impartially. Would it not be wrong for us to oppose its introduction as an articulated major branch into the non-Catholic colleges of our country? Nay, is not the duty heavy upon us to labor for such a desirable eventuality? Half-way measures, of course, will be worse than useless now, as they have been in the past. The system must be taught entire, or not at all. Not single professors, but a faculty of four or five, working co-ordinately over a period of at least four semesters, is required to handle the great scholastic synthesis with anything like educational effectiveness. And furthermore, the department should be supplemented by allied courses in pedagogy and educational psychology, which draw their first principles from scholastic tenets. Thus only can the value of scholasticism as a force in education be fairly tested. It was not fairly tested in the recent experiments at Harvard and Columbia, where one isolated lecturer had to shoulder the burden alone, without the support of a sympathetic curriculum.

Yes, this plan for the sharing of our treasure with secular educators has met with consistent opposition from Catholics. It is argued, for example, that "Catholic philosophy cannot be taught to non-Catholics." Here we have a grievous misuse of terms which must in the end do us more harm than good. "Catholic philosophy" means simply a system which has originated within the Church, and has been adopted by her as an instrument of education. It can in no sense be taken to signify a philosophy inseparable from the Catholic religion. Aristotle was baptized by St. Thomas but he was not ordained priest by him. Scholastic philosophy is Christian, in the circumstance that it has grafted a series of Christian ideas to the nature-analysis of Aristotle. But no strictly Catholic dogma intrudes itself into its content or its method. The obedient servant of theology, it must yet remain distinct from it.

Which of its theses cannot be taught to non-Catholics? But the idea of God, and finality, and the necessity of religion run through it like a band of steel! True, and good. These are truths fundamental to all Christian creeds and peoples, and of themselves will bring the student no nearer Catholicism than to any of the multi-form dissociated sects. What concerns us most nearly is, that they will carry the student far from the materialism and naturalism that infest our colleges today. And finally, in which direction lies the hope of Mother Church eventually to make our loved America Catholic?

The other objection professes to be defensive, regarding not non-Catholics, but our own pupils. Will not the announcement of a scholastic philosophy course in secular schools withdraw from Catholic institutions large numbers

of boys and girls whose sole motive for attending our colleges was this same course? This objection too readily assumes the presence of such a "sole motive" in the case of significant numbers of our children. To pass over the patent fact that there are thousands of Catholics receiving their education outside the Church, who would certainly profit by the new course, is not *religious* instruction the determinant which fills our colleges with students today? Is not this the "sole motive" behind the Church's trumpet-call, "Every Catholic child in a Catholic school"? Then what overpowering attraction is scholastic philosophy likely to have for Catholic parents or children, when it is shorn of the Catholic treatment and atmosphere accorded it in the Catholic college? All the motives we have ever used to foster Catholic education will remain intact after we have lent to non-sectarian schools the keenest natural instrument of education that we possess.

American education needs a dictator. Can we Catholics do it a more blessed service than to din into its ears "Back to Saint Thomas"? Professor de Wulf was constrained to drop the "Saint" in the book he published at Harvard a year or two ago. Very well, if they will not have the Saint, let us give them simply Thomas. His heart belongs to the Church alone; his mind is the property of all mankind.

J. EDWARD COFFEY, S.J.

Sociology

The Right to Strike

THE right to strike is a genuine right. So is the right to form unions and to bargain collectively. It is the only effective safeguard for the laboring man's rights. Leo XIII and the American Bishops in their Labor Program stand sponsors to this doctrine.

But who are the workingmen? Presumably all who work for a wage or a salary. But the wage-earners do not strike in a body. As a rule some particular class of workingmen strikes. The question may be asked: Are any classes of wage-earners prohibited from striking by the very nature or the circumstances of their occupation? For example, may policemen, firemen or soldiers strike? May mail-carriers or railroad employees strike? May nurses form unions to protect their interests and threaten to leave their charges when they have just grievances at a hospital? Such a strike was imminent quite recently. The answer to these questions is not easy to give; but the morality of the strike depends on the answer. A right to perform an act may exist but its exercise may be suspended for a time under given circumstances. This, I venture to say, obtains in the case of the working-classes I have mentioned above. For they are all engaged in work for the public welfare. Their service is of extreme necessity at all times, or at least, in a crisis. Now, if they are permitted by the law of reason to refuse service unless the demands, which they no doubt consider reasonable, are

complied with, the necessary welfare of the whole community is at their mercy and cannot be adequately safeguarded. But this would be contrary to reason. I believe it may be contended that employes of these classes are presumed to engage in that particular service with the tacit understanding that they must and will submit to working conditions and dangers beyond the ordinary and that they shall be permitted to resort to a strike only in a case of extreme necessity. It is clear that for this very reason civil authority is obliged to insist that they be given such working-conditions that they may never have just reason for refusing service. But, as we know, civil government may be remiss in its duty. Sometimes also an impartial tribunal may decide against Government employes. Hence compulsory arbitration, though perhaps objectionable in other departments of work, finds reasonable application in the classes we are speaking of.

Future generations will look back upon our much vaunted civilization with some degree of scepticism. They will express amazement at our tolerating a state of affairs in which, for example, hundreds of trolley cars were run for days and even weeks, from one terminus of the city to the other with no passengers save a policeman holding a rifle in readiness to lay low any assailant, whilst the poor helpless workingman had to walk miles every morning to his place of employment. Blows and bloodshed had to precede a compromise or a settlement of difficulties in which one party or the other triumphed by force and not by right. Posterity will admire but not approve of the infinite patience of the innocent third party which was the inevitable and sometimes the only sufferer in the conflict.

It is sometimes contended that society at large must bear the ills incident to a strike in order to protect the laboring people who form a large part of that society. Justice, they say, is a cornerstone of society. Without it there can be no peace. Industrial society today is a unit. During a strike two factions exist in that unit, the workers and the employers; there is no third party. Hence the solidarity of the laboring-class seems to demand that the public assist by bearing the burdens. This principle may find application in exceptional cases in which a very large number of workingmen are on strike or when the grievances are enormous or some great good, to which the general public has a right, is expected to result from the strike. But if we should extend such a principle to all or to a large majority of the strikes we would have a condition of affairs in which a whole community is subject to uninterrupted hardships with no good resulting, except possibly to a small minority. This happens for example when the police force or the railroad brotherhoods strike. To lay open the city to the ravages of a lawless element is an incalculable evil and danger. To sever the arteries of a nation by a railroad strike means speedy death. The mails, the operation of the factories,

the transportation of raw material, of the finished product, and of the necessities of life would be placed in extreme jeopardy.

In a speech delivered at a Republican state convention in New York a few years ago Elihu Root gave expression to a principle which to his mind ought to govern the relation of organized labor to the public.

We should not attempt to take away the right to strike. It is labor's great protection. But we should by law limit the right at the point where it comes in contact with the community's higher right of self-preservation. No man and no set of men can justly claim the right to undertake the performance of a service upon which health and life of others depend, and then to abandon the service at will. The line between such a performance and an ordinary strike should be drawn by law. Inseparably connected with the right of control by the governing people is the duty of justice resting upon them. If the people by law prohibit organized labor from holding them up to enforce demands, the people are bound to provide means to ascertain whether the demands are just, and for enforcing them if they be found just. That duty calls for the establishment of a competent and impartial tribunal and for the enforcement of its provisions.

Similarly AMERICA commenting some years ago on the right to strike in such cases of which we are speaking said: "In this conflict of rights, compulsory arbitration, conducted by and guaranteed by the State, seems the sole way out of the difficulty. This is not an ideal solution, but in the present state of society it would appear to be all that is practicable."

PHILIP H. BURKETT, S.J.

Note and Comment

Farm Problem and Race Problem

MANY conflicting statements are made regarding the condition of the American farmer. Doubtless this varies greatly according to the different sections of the country. The Catholic Union of Missouri, which certainly is well informed regarding its own locality and deeply interested in the farm problem in general, makes the following statement in the resolutions drawn up at its recent thirty-second annual convention:

The patience of the farmers of our country is, without doubt, being sorely tried. They are not obtaining the reward for their labors due them. Together with productive labor of every kind they are the victims of a system which makes it possible for non-producers to appropriate unearned increment by means of usurious practises. What these gain others must lose. This should not be, since it is immoral and tends to create two classes in society: the very rich and a permanent proletariat.

While calling upon the State and national Government "to do what lies in their province and power to alleviate the present condition of the farmer," the Catholic Union of Missouri does not fail to emphasize the duty of self-help on the part of the farmers themselves. Special attention is called to cooperation based on the Rochdale plan. It is interesting to note that among many other excellent social resolutions the Negro problem is also mentioned:

Owing to the increase of the number of Negroes, especially in

our large centers of population, we deem it opportune that Catholics should interest themselves in the welfare of the colored brethren. We recommend the efforts inaugurated in St. Louis and other cities of our State to further this cause. We recommend that every available means be employed to further the spiritual welfare of our colored brethren.

It is well that Catholic organizations should widen their interests to include at least those problems of the day that most urgently clamor for attention.

Karl Marx Not a Bolshevik

THE Jewish Telegraphic Agency brings an account of the refusal of M. Longuet, grandson of Karl Marx, to accede to the Soviet Government's request for permission to transfer the body of his grandfather, the founder of modern Socialism, from Highgate Cemetery, London, to Moscow. The reason is thus assigned:

In refusing M. Longuet pointed out that Bolshevik interpretation of Karl Marx's doctrine was entirely wrong, and for that reason he thought his grandfather would not like his memory to be associated with it. As reported before, the delegation of the Soviet Government, participating in the Anglo-Russian Conference in London, has been carrying on negotiations with the British Government for the transfer of the body.

The Soviet Government is said to have planned for the expenditure of about \$500,000 for the erection of a monument to Karl Marx that was to find its place in the Red Square in Moscow. It may be noted that practically every radical group in turn claimed to offer the only authentic interpretation of Marx. Even in his own day Marx protested that he was anything but a Marxist. In fact he was not consistent with himself and so can be quoted in support of the most diametrically opposite radical views.

Death of Noted Catholic Educator

BY the death of Brother Berchmans, M.A., the Brothers of the Sacred Heart recently lost one of their leading organizers and educators. He had successively presided over the Brothers' colleges at Meridian, Miss.; Vicksburg, Miss.; Muskogee, Okla.; Bay St. Louis, Miss., and Washington, Ind. As a director of schools he was noted for his constructive and progressive methods, setting himself the highest ideals and laboring restlessly for their achievement. One well acquainted with his extraordinary abilities and noble qualities of heart and soul thus describes him in a picture which might well be labeled "The Model Teacher":

Gifted with a mind singularly clear, sagacious and penetrating; a mind richly stored with resources acquired by arduous labor, painstaking study, wide research, he held his youthful audience by the magnetic power of his intellectual ability. His was a towering mind that came down to the level of his pupils' minds to bring them up to its own heights. He loved his work. He loved his pupils. He threw himself whole-heartedly into the task of making of them good scholars, men of character, good and useful citizens, and above all good and fearless Christians. He gave

of the best that was in him that others might share the gifts wherewith God had endowed him.

The hundreds of his former students, now found in responsible positions of life, testify to the worth of the training they received from him.

The Struggles of Cooperatives

COOPERATION continues in its slow but steady and solid progress throughout the United States. That our cooperatives are gradually being schooled to make the necessary sacrifices which successful cooperation often demands in at least its initial stages may be gathered from such instances as the following. A New York condensary had served notice on the members of four locals belonging to the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association of New York that it would accept milk from such producers only as abandoned the cooperative association. In answer the members at once took up the challenge.

They secured possession of an old plant and worked as mechanics and laborers putting it into working order. At the last moment it was discovered that the long disused boiler would not work. At midnight a steam tractor, which had been laid up for the winter, was requisitioned, overhauled, moved six miles to the plant, and connected with the machinery. After hours of hard work the plant was in readiness by morning to receive the first load of milk which arrived. The first day a total of 28,000 pounds of milk was received and separated.

In fine one member only in all the four locals failed in loyalty to his organization.

Uses of Sociology and Religion

IT was once common enough to refer to sociology as the "dismal science." Today men are beginning to understand well enough that it is neither more nor less dismal than human life itself. Indeed its sole purpose is to render life less dismal. The Catholic hopes to accomplish this with the additional and essential aid of religion. In his book, "Studies in the Theory of Human Society," published by Macmillan, Professor Giddings says:

Sociology has been ridiculed as a science which formulates in forbidding terminology the obvious conclusions of common sense. The jibe is an old one, and each science in its day has inherited it. By common sense men could build a bridge that would sustain a given load, but they would waste material. Common sense does not tell the engineer what cross-section his girders must have both to carry the load desired and to insure his retention as a fit adviser to an economical corporation. Under the pressure of external forces, either military or economical, nations adopt policies of unification, which often are extreme and unnecessarily costly in many ways. Reacting from these they relax the social pressure not only on the socialized and self-controlled, but also on the unscrupulous exploiter and the predatory criminal. It will be possible to subject these empirical policies to a rational criticism when sociology has provided us with approximately accurate measures of social forces, and of the correlation between social pressure and both the concentration and the composition of the population.

All this is true, but it is a pity that the effectiveness of so many well intentioned works like the above is vitiated

by a false evolutionary materialism underlying them and constantly obtruding itself in many ways. "Religion," writes Dr. Giddings, "the esthetic and the scientific life, are initial products of the struggle to react, to hold out and to go on." This nominally recognizes the value of religion and classes its usefulness with estheticism and science, but by making it a product of the same causes denies the supernatural character of the Church and so would make of it a falsehood, for the Church is either divinely instituted or else is a lie. Sociology can never accomplish its purpose until it works in conjunction with religion, not as a materialistic social evolution, but as a full recognition of the supernatural life and man's accountability in all his actions to an almighty Creator.

A New Social Venture, "The Inquiry"

A NEW movement has been started within the Protestant Churches, known as "The Inquiry." Proof editions of the literature issued by it have just reached us. They indicate a method of procedure similar in certain respects to the National Catholic Industrial Conference, namely a formulation of social thought from the rank and file, with this difference, that in the former instance the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII "On the Condition of Labor" is constituted the ultimate basis of discussion, thus assuring a safe guide and common first principles freely accepted by employer, employee and the public who participate in the Conference. The Inquiry is however regarded as only a transient institution whose great object is to prepare for the holding of a National Conference on "the meaning of Christianity for human relationships, with especial attention to industry, citizenship and race relations in the United States." This will probably take place in the summer of 1926 or 1927. An interim conference, however, will be held in 1925. During all this period study groups are to be formed, consisting in each case of outspoken representatives of the different industrial and social classes. Specific instances, such as the great steel strike, will be taken for discussion. The duty of the chairman is to see that ascertainable facts are substituted for emotional statements, and finally that definite conclusions are arrived at to which all can subscribe. The pamphlets to be used analyze the subject, and propose numberless questions that arise in connection with it. The conclusions are to be noted down and sent to headquarters.

The Inquiry aims to bring to bear the widest variety of opinion, judgment and experience upon the major problems of the day. Anyone who has ordinary intelligence and who is capable of a conscientious and sustained application to the task can contribute to the undertaking. There will be an essential function for experts in the various fields, but that function is mainly to contribute to the technique and the content of the main process.

The venture here described had its origin in the Federal Council of Churches and is controlled by the National Conference on the Christian Way of Life.